The Communist

10c. SEPTEMBER 1940

THE HAVANA CONFERENCE

WILLIAM Z. FOSTER

LABOR AND THE ELECTIONS

GENE DENNIS

EXIT MAYOR HOAN

N. SPARKS and F. B. BLAIR

THE STRUGGLE FOR EQUAL RIGHTS FOR WOMEN

MARGARET COWL

ELECTION PLATFORM OF THE COMMUNIST PARTY

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

1940 ELECTION LITERATURE

•

Election Platform of the Communist Party 1940 . . . **$.01**
A political analysis of the candidates, issues and parties in the 1940 elections, and a programmatic call to struggle for peace, jobs and civil liberties.

Campaign Book: Presidential Elections 1940 . . . . **.15**
Facts for speakers, writers, canvassers and other campaign workers, prepared by the National Election Campaign Committee of the C.P.U.S.A.

Earl Browder Talks to the Senators . . . . . **.05**
Verbatim report of testimony at the Senate Judiciary Committee hearing on the Voorhis ("Blacklist") Bill.

Farmers and the War, by Jasper Haaland . . . . . **.03**
The farmers' problems discussed by a North Dakota farmer who is the Communist Party's candidate for U. S. Senator.

Why the Negro People Should Vote Communist,
by Theodore Bassett . . . . . **.01**
The Negro's stake in the 1940 elections, and his conditions under the administrations of the two old parties in the past.

Women, Vote for Life! by Meridel LeSueur and Ann Rivington **.01**
Women's role in determining the future of America by voting for peace, jobs and democracy, and rejecting Roosevelt, Willkie and Wall Street.

Foreign Born, Stand Up for Your Rights! by Israel Amter . **.01**
A defense of the three and one-half million workers of foreign extraction who are being persecuted under the Alien Registration Act, and of other Americans of foreign parentage.

Browder and Ford for Peace, Jobs, Socialism,
by Ruth McKenney . . . . . **.02**
A lively analysis of candidates and issues in the 1940 elections, and a call for unity in defense of the people's interests.

The Jewish People in the 1940 Elections, by John Arnold . **.01**
An expose of the reactionary policies being advanced by the Roosevelt Administration, with the support of Willkie, Wall Street, Coughlin, the Ku Klux Klan, etc.

•

Order from

WORKERS LIBRARY PUBLISHERS

P. O. Box 148, Station D, New York, N. Y.

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

VOL. XIX, No. 9 SEPTEMBER, 1940

THE COMMUNIST

A MAGAZINE OF THE THEORY AND PRACTICE OF MARXISM-LENINISM
PUBLISHED MONTHLY BY THE COMMUNIST PARTY OF THE U.S.A.
EDITOR: EARL BROWDER

CONTENTS

Break the Grip of Wall Street's Twin War-Party	*National Committee, C.P.U.S.A.*	771
Review of the Month	*A. B.*	774
Election Platform of the Communist Party of the U.S.A., 1940:		
Basic Political Outline for the Platform	*Earl Browder*	791
Text of the Platform		797
The Pan-American Conference in Havana	*William Z. Foster*	805
Labor and the Elections	*Gene Dennis*	820
Exit Mayor Hoan	*N. Sparks* and *F. B. Blair*	842
The Struggle for Equal Rights for Women	*Margaret Cowl*	856

Entered as second class matter November 2, 1927, at the Post Office at New York, N. Y., under the Act of March 3, 1879. Send checks, money orders and correspondence to THE COMMUNIST, *P. O. Box 148, Sta. D (50 E. 13th St.), New York. Subscription rates: $2.00 a year; $1.00 for six months; foreign and Canada $2.50 a year. Single copies 20 cents.*

PRINTED IN THE U.S.A. 209

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Recent Books

Dialectics of Nature, by Frederick Engels $2.50

Why Farmers Are Poor: The Agricultural Crisis in the United States, by Anna Rochester 2.25

The Fat Years and the Lean, by Bruce Minton and John Stuart 2.50

The Second Imperialist War, by Earl Browder 2.00

Stalin, by V. M. Molotov, K. Voroshilov and Others 75

The South in Progress, by Katherine Lumpkin 2.00

Salute to Spring, by Meridel LeSueur 1.50

Shoes: the Workers and the Industry, by Horace Davis . 1.50

●

Recent Pamphlets

The British Labor Movement, by Frederick Engels 15

On Historical Materialism, by Frederick Engels 10

Dialectical and Historical Materialism, by Joseph Stalin . .15

The Negro in the American Revolution, by Herbert Aptheker .15

Marx, Engels and Lenin on Ireland, by Ralph Fox 15

The Civil War in France, by Karl Marx 25

War and the Workers, by V. I. Lenin 10

●

Order from

WORKERS LIBRARY PUBLISHERS

P. O. Box 148, Station D, New York, N. Y.

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

BREAK THE GRIP OF WALL STREET'S TWIN WAR-PARTY

STATEMENT OF THE NATIONAL COMMITTEE OF THE COMMUNIST PARTY OF THE UNITED STATES, JULY 30, 1940

THE 1940 conventions of the Republican and Democratic parties restored once more the traditional "two-party system," by which Wall Street (finance capital and the great monopolists, the "sixty families," the economic royalists), controlling both major parties, invites the masses to choose the label under which they shall be exploited and oppressed for the ensuing four years.

For the masses of the American people there is no way to advance their interests through either the Republican or the Democratic Party. This basic fact was thoroughly demonstrated by their conventions.

War or peace, the question of foreign policy, is the decisive issue which dominates all others. Both the old parties made hypocritical concessions in their platforms to the overwhelming anti-war sentiments of the people, in almost identical words, and both parties proceeded full steam ahead on the course of war and preparations for war, on a path of full-fledged aggressive imperialism.

* * *

The outbreak of the imperialist war long ago ended that split in the bourgeoisie, the ruling class, in which the Roosevelt camp rallied the masses against the economic royalists, and made concessions to the people which were known as the New Deal. Roosevelt today, with his whole party, is busily dismantling the New Deal, and is bidding energetically for the support of the economic royalists, trying to prove to them that he can carry out their program much more effectively than could their own direct representative, Wendell Willkie, and his newly-adopted Republican Party. Willkie, on the other hand, has fully solidarized himself with Roosevelt's foreign policy, and regarding Roosevelt's latest domestic course only claims that he would carry it out better by ridding the Administration of "leftists" and labor people, and replacing them with solid and substantial businessmen. As against the needs and demands of the masses, the Republican and Democratic parties are solidly united; in words they recognize them, but in deeds they betray them; the fight between the two old parties is a real fight only within the limitations of their united front

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

against the people; their differences are only those between the special interests and groups within the ruling classes, between two methods of doing the same thing, and between the vested interests of the professional politicians of the two parties, the rivalry between "Ins" and "Outs."

Republicans and Democrats, Willkie and Roosevelt, are united on a war program of tens of billions of dollars in armaments, and millions of conscripted soldiers, all of which makes sense only as preparations for jumping into the middle of the imperialist war of redivision of the world.

* * *

Republicans and Democrats are united on a foreign policy of sharpest hostility against the Soviet Union, thus repulsing the only powerful potential friend of the United States, and the greatest force for peace in this war-torn world. Both agree on the policy called "aiding the Allies," the most practical result of which was to give Hitler more American planes than the United States army and navy has today. Both are agreed in sacrificing China to the Japanese militarists, just as they agreed on stabbing Spain in the back, to gain profits for American imperialists. Both are united on an attitude toward Latin America of which the infamous Sumner Welles is the symbol, so hated by Latin Americans, which combines every odious feature of imperialist domination.

Republicans and Democrats agree, in the field of domestic policy, that "labor must be put in its place" and sharply curbed, that civil liberties for the masses shall be drastically curtailed, that social legislation must be subordinated to the needs of the gigantic armaments program, that profits to the capitalists must go up while the living standards of the masses must go down, that taxation of the masses must increase while taxation of the capitalists must be reduced. Their differences are only of method, and of degrees of demagogy; the difference between "Ins" and "Outs," and between varying social composition of their followings. But the Hillmans and Tobins, busily rallying the workers for Roosevelt, does not change the reactionary character of Roosevelt's present course, but only proves that "labor leaders" can also enter the service of Wall Street and betray the workers.

In the face of these agreements, proved by deeds during the past year as well as most recently in the two conventions, of what importance to the masses of the people are any differences or conflicts that may exist between Republicans and Democrats, between Willkie and Roosevelt?

* * *

The most reactionary section of finance capital, which is at the same time the most powerful and decisive, controls and is represented by both Republican and Democratic parties, both Willkie and Roosevelt. Their differences, so far as the

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

people are concerned, amount to no more than a division of labor, the better to deceive the masses, and to prevent their independent political organization and struggles, while the chains of conscription for bloody war and unexampled exploitation are riveted around their necks.

Clearly, for the people such conflicts are meaningless. Toward the Republican and Democratic parties the people, to the extent that they are politically awake and conscious, can have but one word: "A plague on both your houses!"

The working class, and all toilers, the people, must begin to break the vicious circle of the "two-party system," which binds them under the dictatorship of the economic royalists. There can be no progress, except that which begins with the repudiation of both Wall Street's parties.

That is the great outstanding lesson of the Philadelphia and Chicago conventions of the Republican and Democratic parties. That is the beginning of political wisdom for the common people of America.

NATIONAL COMMITTEE,
Communist Party of the
United States.

WILLIAM Z. FOSTER,
Chairman,
EARL BROWDER,
General Secretary.

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

REVIEW OF THE MONTH

Molotov's Report to the Supreme Soviet. Changes Resulting From the First Year of War. Consequences and Perspectives. Successes of Soviet Union Strengthen Anti-Imperialist Camp. Potential Strength of Working Class Must Be Made Actual. What Is the Way? Willkie and Hoover State a Main Issue. Roosevelt, Blum and the Lessons of France. Anti-Sovietism Is the Proven Road to National Disaster. On the True Meaning of "Opposition to All Dictatorships." Progressive Labor Must Not Let Itself Be Intimidated by Anti-Sovietism. Imperialist-Reactionary Offensive in America Is Gaining Momentum. On the Fight Against Conscription. Browder Raises Momentous Issue of Free Elections. The Election Tactics of Willkie and Roosevelt. Our Differentiated Methods of Attack. The Communist Party of Germany Fights for a People's Peace.

REPORTING to the historic seventh session of the Supreme Soviet, on August 1, Comrade Molotov said:

"The first year of the European war is drawing to a close, but the end of the war is not yet in sight. It is more probable that we are now on the eve of a new stage of the intensification of the war between Germany and Italy on the one side and England, assisted by the United States, on the other." (V. M. Molotov, *Soviet Foreign Relations*, p. 5, Workers Library Publishers, New York.)

After twelve months of imperialist war, which has brought the masses infinite suffering and general ruination, and in which the international working class has not yet become strong enough to lead the peoples to true peace in defiance of the imperialist criminals, the danger in the present situation is that the war may spread further and become transformed into a world imperialist war. To prepare to meet and combat this danger is the major task of the anti-imperialist camp.

The course of developments during the first year of the war has produced material changes in the relation of forces: changes within the camp of imperialism and changes in the relation of forces between the imperialist camp and the anti-imperialist camp. The key to seeing the immediate future lies in an understanding of these changes and the consequences which they are likely to bring.

It is evident that, in the imperialist camp, the German-Italian side has become stronger while the British side has become weaker. And

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

this, as Comrade Molotov points out, produces "serious reverberations not only in Europe but in other parts of the world." Defeated by German imperialism, France, Belgium and Holland are no longer in a position to defend their extensive colonial possessions with the same power as in the past. Naturally, the question of who is going to grab these colonies becomes very acute, tending to draw into the imperialist struggle for their possession such "neutrals" as the imperialists of Japan and the United States. Japanese imperialism is preparing to get hold of French Indo-China and the Dutch East Indies. American imperialism, in its struggle for the control of the Pacific and for world domination, is equally preparing to prevent this from happening, while driving full speed ahead to take possession of the European colonies in the Western Hemisphere as well as of the Latin American republics. And it is from this situation that the danger arises most immediately of the further spreading of the war and of its becoming a world imperialist war.

In other words, the immediate and direct consequence of the strengthening of one side—the German side—in the imperialist camp and the weakening of its opponent is *not* an outlook for the speedy termination of the war but of its extension and intensification. It is clear, therefore, that changes in the relation of forces within the imperialist camp, the strengthening of one side and the weakening of the other, carry no promise to the masses for the speedy termination of the war or for a true people's peace. Defeated France, betrayed and ruined by its imperialist bourgeoisie and the "Socialist" leaders, has obtained an armistice but not yet peace. "Nothing is known as yet about peace terms," said Comrade Molotov. And does the declared determination of British imperialism to continue the war, despite the defeat of France, carry any different or better promise to the masses? No, it does not. "The government of Great Britain," said Comrade Molotov, "does not wish to give up the colonies which Britain possesses in all parts of the globe and declares that it is prepared to continue the war for world supremacy," counting on aid from the United States. This British government, of which the "Socialist" leaders of the British Labor Party form a large part, has just recently once again challenged most brazenly the dearest aspirations of the Indian people for independence, reasserting its intention to continue to keep that great country in colonial subjugation. The British government continues therefore a predatory war of imperialist domination, even though under far more difficult conditions.

No. No change in the relation of forces within the imperialist camp, neither a strengthening of one side nor a weakening of the other, carries any serious promises to the masses of a speedy termination of the war and, least of all, of a true people's peace as against a so-called imperialist "peace" of violence and

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

oppression. If there is one single major lesson from the events of the first year of the war, it is that only the masses themselves, headed by a united working class, fighting militantly and consistently for an anti-imperialist policy nationally and internationally and—above all—rallying around the socialist Soviet Union and actively supporting its peace policy—only thus can the imperialist war be terminated speedily and a people's peace established. There is no other way.

It is in the light of the foregoing considerations that one can best understand the full meaning of Molotov's declaration on the future foreign policies of the Soviet Union. He said:

"All these events have not caused a change in the foreign policy of the Soviet Union. True to its policy of peace and neutrality, the Soviet Union is not taking part in the war." (*Ibid.*, p. 5.)

The promise and hope for peace continues to lie in the developing changes in the relation of forces between the imperialist camp and the *anti*-imperialist camp, in the weakening of the former and the strengthening of the latter. And the first year of the war has produced material changes also in this sphere.

It is beyond dispute that the anti-imperialist camp of the masses of the people, on a world scale, is today stronger than a year ago. This is a basic and fundamental fact.

Take first the condition of the anti-imperialist camp in the imperialist countries. Looked at superficially, one might conclude that the anti-imperialist forces in the capitalist world are today weaker than a year ago. But that isn't so. Allowing for the great unevenness of development as regards various countries, the true thing to say of all of them is this: the anti-imperialist forces in the capitalist world are compelled now to gather their strength and to fight under more difficult and *more complicated* conditions than at the outbreak of the war; but they have become more mature and better equipped for their respective tasks, the widest masses of the people are finding out through their own bitter experiences the correctness of the anti-imperialist message, and the general objective situation has become more favorable.

Capitalism today is weaker than a year ago. Its foundations have become more undermined and less secure. This is true, in varying degrees, for the capitalist belligerents as well as "neutrals," for those who have scored military successes (Germany) and for those who have suffered reverses (Britain) or defeats (France). The indignation and resentment of the masses with imperialist rule have grown tremendously. It is a fact that the widest masses of the people are most rapidly losing their faith in the bourgeoisie, in all capitalist countries, though not with the same tempo. And the Social-Democratic agents of the imperialists, the most serious obstacle to the progress of the masses, are steadily losing ground.

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

They have certainly made no gains in the past year, while the influence of the Communist Parties is spreading and growing everywhere.

In his May Day statement on *The Struggle Against the Imperialist War,* Georgi Dimitroff observed that "the war is not only causing difficulties for the struggle of the working class, it is also causing tremendous difficulties for the bourgeoisie itself." Life is confirming that fully. Difficulties for the working class have increased; but so have in even larger measure increased the difficulties for the imperialist bourgeoisie. While the tremendous strength possessed by the working class has not yet come into effective expression to end the war in its own way, that strength still being largely potential; and while difficulties of the greatest magnitude have still to be overcome to make the strength of the working class actual and effective, it is none the less true that the working class is nearer today to the realization of its strength than at the outbreak of the war, that the day of reckoning with the imperialist criminals has drawn closer.

We must also take full note of the favorable developments that are taking place among the allies of the working class in the colonial and dependent countries. The great national liberation struggle of the Chinese people against Japanese imperialism is displaying a strength that is continually confounding its enemies while rendering the utmost encouragement to its friends. At the same time, the people of India are rapidly gathering strength for a showdown with British imperialism and for the realization of their national independence. And in Latin America, the anti-imperialist mass movements are further developing and strengthening, spurred on by the fresh offensive of American imperialism and the sharpening rivalries in the imperialist camp. All these developments constitute a source of great strength to the working class and, by that same token, a fatal weakness for imperialism.

And then—the successes of the Soviet Union, the greatest and most decisive force, the most powerful bulwark in the struggle of the world proletariat for peace. Its treaty with Germany, after the Soviet Union had done everything in its power to prevent the war, has *effectively kept the war out of Eastern Europe.* That is a fact. Pursuing its socialist peace policy further, the Soviet Union has liberated thirteen million people of the Western Ukraine and Western Byelorussia. The victory of the Red Army over the Finnish White Guards has destroyed an imperialist war base at the very gates of Leningrad, and the conclusion of peace with Finland brought to nought the conspiracies of the Anglo-French imperialists to embroil the Soviet Union in war.

More recently the peoples of Bessarabia and Northern Bukovina obtained the opportunity of joining the Soviet Union, thanks to the peace policy of the Soviet govern-

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

ment, which liberated nearly four million people from the intolerable and brutal oppression of the Rumanian landlords and capitalists. And finally the affiliation of Lithuania, Latvia and Estonia with the socialist state. The representatives of these three countries, elected in the most democratic way, have voted unanimously for the establishment of the Soviet system and for affiliation with the great Soviet Union. Thus, during the past year, the population of the Soviet Union has been increased by over twenty-three million people, the overwhelming majority of whom were formerly part of the socialist country and have now been reunited. The frontiers of the socialist state have moved westward, reaching the Danube in the South and the Baltic in the North. The prerequisities for a sound and durable peace in those regions of the world are becoming stronger and more consolidated.

On these historic developments, Comrade Molotov said:

"The successes of the foreign policy of the Soviet Union are all the more significant in that we have achieved them all by peaceful means, and in that the peaceful settlement of the questions both of the Baltic countries and Bessarabia was achieved *with the active cooperation and support of the broad masses of people of these countries.*" (Our emphasis—*A.B.*) (*Cited place*, p. 10.)

These successes of the Soviet Union have added infinite strength to the working class of the world, to the anti-imperialist camp generally, to the struggle of the oppressed masses everywhere for peace, security and freedom. *These successes have shifted the relation of forces in the world in a direction more favorable to the masses, less favorable to their exploiters and oppressors.* And the outlook is for more and further indispensable achievements by the socialist state because, as Comrade Molotov remarked, "We do not intend to rest content with what we have achieved." (*Ibid.*, p. 15.)

Labor in our own country, as well as in all capitalist countries, should examine thoughtfully these achievements, not letting itself be intimidated by the wild howl of the imperialist exploiters and their reformist agents who hate and fear the successes of the Soviet Union. Labor has a great stake in these successes. Labor can grow stronger and mightier because of them. But for this, certain policies have to be pursued, a certain line of action has to be followed. It is the policy and line of action of the anti-imperialist people's front, headed by labor. It is a line of policy which requires working class unity, a people's front led by the working class, united international action by the proletariat in pursuit of an independent international policy against imperialist war, support for and collaboration with the liberation movements of the colonial peoples, and the rallying around the Soviet Union in support of its socialist peace policy.

Thus and only thus will the tre-

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

mendous potential strength of the working class become more actual and effective in the great struggles of the masses for peace, freedom and social security. And to achieve these objectives, the imperialist agents in the labor movement, the reformist and Social-Democratic leaders—the Greens, Wolls, Thomases and Hillmans—must be thoroughly exposed and systematically combated.

* * *

AN INTERESTING and revealing sidelight on the unfolding election struggle in the United States is the dispute between the spokesmen of the two capitalist parties on the lessons of France for America. This dispute may perhaps become more than a sidelight. At any rate, it tends to expose in a certain measure the imperialist, anti-national and reactionary nature of their respective programs of "national" defense.

In an interview with the press, while visiting Willkie in Colorado Springs, and in reply to a question as to which was the most important issue in the campaign, Herbert Hoover delivered himself as follows:

"The most outstanding is that of the whole social system of the American people. The feeling is growing all over the country that we are in the midst of another Blum administration" (*New York Herald Tribune,* August 12.)

This is not the first time that certain Republicans have indicated their intention of fighting Roosevelt in the elections as another Blum—a "reformer," a "Socialist," an adherent of "class struggle," whose policies have ruined France and—followed by Roosevelt—are bound to ruin the United States. Hoover, followed by Willkie, is trying it again and as a major campaign issue. His purposes in doing so are relatively clear. By hiding the true role of Blum and the true lessons of France for America—Blum the agent of the traitorous 200 ruling families of France and betrayer of the People's Front—Hoover seeks to bolster up the waning prestige of the ruling families of the United States. He seeks to revive among the masses confidence in the leadership of Big Business and of its *direct* representative, Wendell Willkie. But we must not let him succeed. We must discuss the genuine and full truth of the lesson of France, and this will bring no comfort either to the Republicans or the Democrats.

In the references to France made by Comrade Molotov in his report, we find a number of highly fruitful ideas on this question. He said:

"There is no need to dwell here on all the causes that brought about the defeat of France, who revealed her exceptional weakness in war. Clearly, the cause lay not only in bad military preparedness, although this cause has now become universally known. Of considerable importance was also the fact that, unlike Germany, the leading circles of France treated too lightly the role and weight of the Soviet Union in European affairs." (*Cited place,* p. 4.)

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Let us first emphasize the point that bad military preparedness was not the only cause of France's defeat. It is important to do so, especially in meeting those who are harping on *military* preparedness by the United States as practically the only thing necessary for national defense. But what of the other things? Comrade Molotov mentions another cause for the defeat of France: her ruling circles "treated too lightly" the role of the Soviet Union—its role and weight. Is that true? Absolutely true. It is a fact, for which the people of France are paying in blood and indescribable suffering, that French Big Business, the Wall Street of France, had prevented the French people from collaborating with and cementing their alliance with the Soviet Union, continually conspiring through all these years to bring about attacks and wars against the Soviet Union. It is also a fact that Leon Blum, the leader of the Socialist Party of France, while committed to the People's Front program of collaboration and alliance with the Soviet Union, had in fact carried out an opposite policy, one of treachery and hostility to the Soviet Union, the policy of France's 200 families.

Does Herbert Hoover recognize *himself* in this policy? He can't miss the resemblance; it is too close. His habit (of long standing) of taking the Soviet Union "lightly" and his "uncompromising" hostility to it are too well known. His position on the Soviet Union in the United States is almost the exact counterpart of that of the 200 families in France. Is it not evident that the pursuit of Hoover's anti-Soviet policies by the United States might lead, under certain conditions, to consequences not very dissimilar to those suffered by France? Very evident. And this is one big lesson of France to be digested and fully understood. It is the lesson that anti-Sovietism leads to the betrayal of the national interests of one's own people. And when American workers and trade unionists find themselves, as they often do, driven by imperialist Big Business and their reformist agents to condemn the Soviet Union "the same as other dictatorships," an attempt at intimidation which succeeded at the convention of the auto workers' union, these workers and trade unionists should think of the lesson of France. They should think of the proven fact that anti-Sovietism spells Big Business dictatorship and national betrayal; that if allowed to develop, it leads to national disaster.

And does Franklin Roosevelt recognize himself in the anti-Soviet policies of the French 200 families? He should recognize at least a number of common features; the most important one being that he, too, treated very lightly the role and weight of the Soviet Union, even though it was under his Administration that diplomatic relations were established between the United States and the Soviet Union. The fact that Roosevelt's anti-Sovietism is not exactly of the same brand and form as that of Hoover, this need not be disputed. Whereas the

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Hoovers adhere to the more classic position of the Munich "appeasers," who would betray their own nations to the fascist powers rather than see the Soviet Union grow and prosper, the Roosevelt position prides itself on being "impartially" opposed to both, the fascist powers and the Soviet Union, opposed "to all dictatorships." And this is supposed to be the highest wisdom of bourgeois-democratic statesmanship. Yet the fact of the matter is that, whatever this "impartiality" may mean in theory, *in practice* it has worked along the lines of the Munich "appeasers." No wonder, therefore, that Comrade Molotov could report to the Supreme Soviet nothing good in Soviet-American relations.

But there is still another lesson in France's defeat. Said Molotov:

"The events of the past months . . . have shown that the ruling circles of France were not connected with the people and, far from relying on their support, feared their people, who are deservedly famed as a liberty-loving people with glorious revolutionary traditions. That was one of the serious causes of France's weakness that has now revealed itself." (*Ibid.*)

Is that true? Absolutely true. This is demonstrated most convincingly by the dastardly war which the 200 families had carried on against the People's Front (not to be confused with Blum and Daladier—the traitors of the People's Front), against the movement of the French people, headed by labor, which carried the promise of rebuilding France into a free and powerful nation, participating in a leading capacity in the maintenance and preservation of world peace. And with the outbreak of hostilities between the Allies and Germany last September, these same 200 families were carrying on war, not against Germany, but against their own people and the Communist Party, continually conspiring to provoke war with the Soviet Union. Blum, Daladier and Reynaud have through all these developments carried out the will of the French imperialist bourgeoisie.

Is it not evident that the Hoovers occupy the same general position with respect to the American people as that of the French ruling circles with respect to the French people? The Hoovers fear and hate the American people, their great democratic traditions, their stubborn determination to preserve and extend their liberties. And the Roosevelts? For a while the Roosevelts were making advances to the people, moving with them (always haltingly and hesitatingly) in one general direction against the onslaughts of the reactionaries. But even then the Roosevelts could not hide their hostility to the independence and influence of labor (the backbone of all progressive movements of the people), sabotaging and combating labor's progress; even then the Roosevelts were manifestly fearful of the self-activity and independent actions of the people, always compromising with and surrendering to

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

the reactionaries rather than let the people, headed by labor, assert themselves with their full might. And since the outbreak of the war, the Roosevelts have been practically *competing* with the Hoovers for the favors of reactionary Big Business. The very first thing the Roosevelt Administration initiated in its drive for "national" defense was an attack upon the civil liberties and economic standards of the people, singling out the Communist Party as the first objective; and this attack upon the people is continually gathering momentum. How similar to the conduct of the French ruling circles!

The Hoovers and the Willkies are not fully satisfied with the Roosevelts. They would want to push the attack upon the people, under the guise of "national" defense, faster and more ruthlessly. That is so. But that merely makes them even more of a counterpart of the French 200 families than would appear otherwise. It reveals them more definitely as those forces in American life which would ruin the United States quicker than the Roosevelts could. However, both are working towards its ruination.

These are only some of the more important lessons of France. And in these, the special role of Leon Blum carries particular enlightenment. In his case, we are dealing with a Social-Democratic leader, a leader of the French Socialist party and of the Second International. It is a "classic" case of the working out of Social-Democratism, of reformism, in the present world situation. Blum has been functioning as an agent of the French imperialist bourgeoisie in the labor movement. He has been functioning as the agent or labor lieutenant of the French Hoovers *and* Roosevelts, of the French imperialist bourgeoisie. And that explains everything in Blum's doings: his treachery to the People's Front and his "special" contribution to the defeat of France.

According to Willkie and Hoover, Roosevelt is an American Blum. This is nonsense, of course. If we should go merely by analogies and counterparts (which is not a safe way of doing things), the American counterparts of Blum, in political attitude and social role, would be found among the Norman Thomases, the Sidney Hillmans, the William Greens and that fraternity. And these are the leaders of Social-Democratism in the United States which have to be combated most relentlessly in order to promote the people's movements for peace, security and freedom.

Yet there is a common element in the political conduct of Blum and Roosevelt (not in their social role) which Hoover tries to distort and put to use in the Willkie campaign. What is this common element in political conduct? It is the discredited bourgeois-democratic flag of "impartiality" of opposition "to all dictatorships," to both the Soviet Union and the fascist powers, to both socialist democracy under working class rule and to fascist rule under Big Business imperialism. This is

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

the common element. From which followed the inherent readiness of both Roosevelt and Blum always to concede to the pressure of the pro-fascist reactionaries, in domestic as well as foreign affairs, rather than rely upon the people and call upon *them* to act, to scotch in their own way the conspiracies of reaction, to protect and extend and further develop democracy, a higher form of democracy, and to move to a new life.

Consequently, when Hoover and Willkie identify Roosevelt with Blum, attacking both as a source of national ruination, what they are *actually* attacking, against their own will, is *Roosevelt's failure and inability to fight the Hoovers and Willkies to a finish.* They are attacking unwittingly Roosevelt's steady surrender to the same Hoovers and Willkies. They are attacking, without knowing it, Roosevelt's fear of the American people and his class attachment to capitalism and capitalist rule.

From which the American people will be led to conclude that *their* way lies neither with Willkie-Hoover nor with Roosevelt, but with *themselves*, in a united anti-imperialist people's front led by labor. A people's front built without the Roosevelts and against them. A people's front built in unremitting and concentrated struggle of the masses against the Hoover-Willkie "appeasers" of fascism at home and abroad as well as in exposure of and struggle against the Roosevelt so-called "impartiality" of opposition "to all dictatorships," which in practice works out as the line of the Hoover-"appeasers," which in practice promotes reactionary dictatorship at home and imperialist war abroad. A people's front built in the struggle against both parties of the bourgeoisie, for labor's political independence and leadership.

And to this is devoted the election struggle of the Communist Party, of its standard bearers—Earl Browder and James W. Ford.

* * *

The imperialist reactionary offensive upon the economic standards and civil rights of the masses of the American people continues and is gathering momentum. The Roosevelt administration is apparently determined not to be forestalled or outdone by its Willkie-Hoover opponents in the matter of hamstringing and chaining the people to Wall Street under the guise of national defense. The "criticisms" of the Republicans are visibly spurring on the New Dealers of yesterday to ever greater and better exertions in the "noble" cause of imperialism and reaction.

Outstanding phases in the imperialist-reactionary drive are the menace of conscription, and conscription in peace time; the steady capitalist pressure to whittle away labor's rights and trade union standards, in which Sidney Hillman is proving very helpful to the imperialists; the government's fiscal policy, characterized brilliantly by John

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

L. Lewis as "making patriotism profitable for American finance and industry"; and last, but not least, the brazen disregard and violations of the Bill of Rights.

It is highly significant that, thus far, the only tangible product of the imperialist drive for "national" defense is the reactionary drive upon the rights and standards of the people. Which reminds us again of France. Of airplanes and tanks, there is still more talk than production, because industry and finance do not think that patriotism has as yet been made sufficiently profitable for them; but efforts of workers to make employers live up to the provisions of the National Labor Relations Act, or to protect and improve their wage and hour standards, are branded by government agencies and by Wall Street as "subversive" and are referred for handling to Mr. Hillman (who believes in labor making "sacrifices") and to the Federal Bureau of Investigation.

Most ominous and menacing is the conscription drive. The masses of the people, headed by labor, are against it. They sense and realize that conscription at this time is dictated not by the needs of true national defense but by Wall Street's desire to hamstring the people into a reactionary dictatorship and to prepare for imperialist war. Mass opposition to conscription is therefore growing. And the anti-war congress to be held in Chicago the end of August will play an important part in the struggle. And whatever its outcome—the defeat of the measure is a practical possibility—the struggle itself can be made to contribute immeasurably to the general anti-war movement and to further building of the anti-imperialist people's front.

Dealing with labor standards on government contracts, John L. Lewis wrote the following to the Executive Board of the C.I.O.:

"Under the urge of a declared emergency, the Government is making patriotism profitable for American finance and industry. Surely it is not too much to expect of Government that it will also protect the inherent and statutory rights of labor to organize and bargain collectively."

There is biting irony here and resentment, reflecting very truthfully the feelings of the wide masses of labor. These masses of labor are already learning that, while it may be too much to expect *this* government to protect labor's rights as it protects capital's "rights," it is not too much *to fight* for the rights of labor; and this means to unfold broad organizing campaigns in the industries, to strengthen the unions in every way, to guard zealously labor's economic standards and to improve them, to promote further labor's political independence and power, to advance labor's independent ties with all common people, to prepare sufficient strength for putting a government into office, a people's government, that *will* protect and defend the rights of the people.

As to the government's fiscal

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

policies (taxation and budget), these are exactly what John Lewis said they were: making patriotism profitable for industry and finance, and *at the expense* of the most elementary needs of the eleven million unemployed, of the wage-and-hour standards and purchasing capacities of the employed workers, at the expense of the toiling farmers, the Negro people, the youth.

The National Defense Tax Law now on the statute books is a positive disgrace. It was the first serious fiscal step after the outbreak of the war and its net effect is to shift further the burden of the crisis and war preparations to the common people. Now the government is fixing up a special bill for the amortization of so-called defense plants, a bill dictated directly and openly by the United States Chamber of Commerce and other agencies of Big Business. It is a bill dictated directly by Big Business—arms and munitions manufacturers—to make the people pay for the expansion of their plants while the sharks of finance capital grab in the profits. In fact these patriotic financiers and industrialists are refusing to begin work on government contracts until a "satisfactory" amortization bill becomes law, despite public governmental pledges to fulfil this demand of Big Business.

But, says the government, we are also fixing up an excess profits tax to be tied up with the amortization bill. To which the answer is, first, that Wall Street demands that the two *not be tied up*, that the amortization bill be passed independently and quickly; and it still remains to be seen whether the government will not give in on this demand also. Secondly, if the amortization bill is passed first, detached from the excess profit bill, the latter will surely be transferred to the next session of Congress and will be handled very leisurely from then on. Thirdly, the excess profits provisions as now drafted are only touching the *surface* of the mounting war profits; it is a caricature and not an effective tax on war profiteering. *The struggle of the people, led by labor, to make the rich pay the cost of war preparations is in reality just beginning.* And the C.I.O. has already established for itself an enviable record of initiative and leadership in this momentous fight.

The war on the Bill of Rights is also developing under the President's motto: "Full speed ahead." Calculatingly, an atmosphere of general terrorization is being created. Having begun with "technical" persecutions against Communists, the war against the Bill of Rights has already spread into wide territory. It has taken in trade unions, religious opponents of war, millions of foreign-born Americans and their native friends and relatives, is reaching out after the youth (through the conscription bill especially). A centralized governmental machine is being created to hunt and persecute every dissenter from the Hoovers, Willkies and Roosevelts. The F.B.I. and the G-Man are

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

becoming the main arm of governmental domestic policy and administration.

Ominously enough but consistent with the general imperialist-reactionary drive, governmental agencies have begun to lay their hands on the Constitutional rights of American citizens to nominate and vote for candidates and parties of their own choice. This is how Comrade Browder fittingly characterized the action of governmental authorities preventing the Communist Party from placing its candidates on the ballot. Speaking of such action in Arizona and West Virginia, he said:

"If allowed to go unchallenged, this is the initial move to end free elections in the United States. We will take these unconstitutional decisions to the people of the country, and to the highest courts of the land. The Communist Party is determined to run its own national standard bearers in opposition to both Roosevelt and Willkie. The citizens of these two states should have the same opportunity, as the citizens of any other states in the Union, to determine for themselves who best represents them."

And the meaning of all this is clear. It is not, of course, the brazen and fraudulent assertion that the destruction of the Bill of Rights is necessary in order to defend American democracy. It is the negation of it. It is done in order to enable American imperialism to subjugate Latin America, to prepare for its war with Japan for domination over the Pacific, to challenge German-Italian imperialist rule in the conquered European countries, to foist upon the American people a full-fledged military-reactionary dictatorship at home through which the Hoover-"appeasers" will manipulate their conspiracies more effectively.

The people of America are faced with the need of making much greater exertions than heretofore to fight this imperialist-reactionary offensive of the bourgeoisie. Greater unity and more self-activity of the masses are the crucial need of the hour. The election platform of the Communist Party embodies the demands of the people and their line of struggle. Our central task in the elections is to rally the *widest masses* around the Communist platform and candidates. The struggle, therefore, of the Communist Party to get and remain on the ballot is a major fight of the people, a fight for their basic constitutional right "to determine for themselves who best represents them."

* * *

WHY is it that Roosevelt and Willkie are still formulating the "issues" of the campaign notwithstanding the fact that their respective parties had already adopted election platforms supposedly containing their positions on all important issues? Why?

One answer is traditional. Namely, that Republican and Democratic platforms don't mean much; that the presidential candidate makes his

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

own issues in the course of the campaign itself, adjusting himself to the ebb and flow of election maneuverings. And in this there is a grain of truth. But in this election there is something else involved in addition. It is the fact that the nominating conventions of the Republican and Democratic parties, which adopted platforms, have not faced fully the major problems, domestic and foreign, confronting the American bourgeoisie in the present world situation; that alignments within the bourgeoisie have not yet settled themselves; that the entire situation is highly unstable. Hence, Roosevelt and Willkie have to produce more complete answers to questions of which their party conventions have only taken notice, to formulate "issues" in such a way as will take care of the fluctuating state of party alignments and of the rapid course of national and international developments.

Yet certain elements in the election *tactics* of the two capitalist parties have already been indicated. These have to be studied so that the anti-imperialist forces can most effectively carry on the fight against the two major parties and for the political independence of the masses, headed by labor.

Roosevelt and Wallace seem to be developing their attack along these lines: The main issue is "national" defense and the chief danger to it comes from those who want "to appease the totalitarians at home and abroad," including in totalitarianism—communism and fascism. The Democratic Party is the only dependable force to defend American democracy from the attacks of both Right and Left; it is the only true champion of "national unity," democracy and social security; it points with pride to its record of administration.

Within this general framework, it is likely that Roosevelt himself will direct his main appeal to the bourgeois and well-to-do circles, while to Wallace will be assigned the more special job of courting labor and the working farmers and of representing the Democratic Party, not for what it really is, but as "a farmer-labor alliance," a real New Deal party.

As to Willkie and McNary, the indications of their election tactics are less clear at this moment. Considering the tremendous influence which Herbert Hoover seems bound to exert upon Republican policy, it may be more correct to speak of the Willkie-Hoover tactics. But that will become clearer as we go along. Meanwhile it is possible to establish the following as the Republican line of attack: The Democratic Party is no longer its old self but has become a New Deal party which does not believe in the "American system," which is seeking surreptitiously to establish some kind of a socialism. Certain New Deal reforms are not bad if "properly" administered, but the New Deal as such is something else altogether. It is something like Leon Blum and the Popular Front which have ruined France.

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Continuing the Republican line of attack: It is making a good deal of the third-term issue, charging Roosevelt with tendencies to personal dictatorship. Roosevelt, it says, is introducing "national disunity" and is arousing class hatreds. The Democratic Party under Roosevelt may become a war party. It rests upon "corrupt political machines" (Hague, Kelly, etc.). It is incompetent as a party of administration.

Furthermore: the Democratic Party is secretly pro-Soviet; it was the one to establish relations with the Soviet Union. It hates business and has ruined American economy. It has not solved the unemployment question. Roosevelt endangers "national" defense by seeking quarrels with Germany. The Democratic Party cannot be entrusted, for all these reasons, with the job of "national" defense. Only the Republican Party can do it. The Republican Party, as represented by Willkie, is the party of American "business genius" and competent administration.

"National" defense, the Republicans say, *is* a major issue, but only the Republican Party can solve it.

In combating the election tactics of the two capitalist parties, we naturally proceed from the realization that the chief issues of the people in the election campaign, as stated in the Communist Party platform, are *jobs, security, peace and freedom.* To fight for these issues successfully means to struggle against the imperialist-reactionary offensive of the bourgeoisie, for keeping America out of war, for defending and protecting the economic standards and political rights of the masses. And this calls for consistent proletarian opposition to the entire camp of imperialism and to both capitalist parties as parties of the imperialist bourgeoisie.

From the foregoing as a fundamental political basis, we must then develop such methods of attack against the class enemy as are best suited to reveal before the masses the imperialist and reactionary character of both capitalist parties. That means *differentiated* methods, since the *election tactics* of the two parties are obviously not the same.

While seeking to win away from the Republicans as much support as possible among the bourgeois and well-to-do circles, Roosevelt and Wallace nevertheless are forced to concentrate largely on preventing wide circles of workers and poorer middle classes from breaking away from Democratic Party support. And this dictates to the Democratic Party one set of tactics which we must meet in a certain way; in a way that will demonstrate before the masses that support for Roosevelt and Wallace means, in the final analysis, support for Willkie and Hoover; in a way that will demonstrate before the masses that Hillman & Co., who are trying to hold labor with Roosevelt, are in the final analysis delivering the masses to Willkie and Hoover.

On the other hand, Willkie and McNary (or, shall we say, Hoover and Willkie?), while seeking to win

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

away from the Democratic Party as much support as possible among the workers and among the poorer middle classes of city and farm, nevertheless concentrate largely on preventing considerable sections of bourgeois and well-to-do circles from breaking away from Republican Party support, and of winning new supports precisely among these circles. And this dictates to the Republican Party another set of tactics, somewhat different from the Democratic Party, which we must meet in a different way; in a way that will show to the masses that the Hoover-Willkie outfit is the *direct* representatives of the most reactionary circles of finance capital, that to elect Willkie for President is like putting into the White House Morgan, Rockefeller and Ford.

As to the reformist and Social-Democratic leaders, whose manipulations among the workers are our most immediate concern, we already had occasion to indicate the existence of a division of functions. Hillman & Co. function as Roosevelt agents in the labor movement; Hutcheson & Co. function as Willkie agents. Norman Thomas preserves an "impartiality" between the two, serves *both* of them by his anti-Soviet and anti-Communist incitements, inclining benevolently towards Willkie. The Lovestoneites play the game of Norman Thomas, while the Trotskyites are conspiring to aggravate and deepen every divisive and anti-working class tendency in the labor movement.

Through this division of functions, the reformist and Social-Democratic leaders are working against the unity and political independence of the working class, thus making their special contribution to the imperialist reactionary offensive of the bourgeoisie. By their anti-Soviet and anti-Communist incitements they are contributing most directly to the intensification of the attacks upon the masses by the class enemy. To expose this role of the Social-Democratic and reformist leaders and to rally wide masses in struggle against them—this remains the major means of effectively combating the two parties of the American imperialist bourgeoisie.

The Communist Party of the United States has the program and line of political conduct which the people need and to which wide masses of them will respond. It is so for domestic affairs as well as in the field of relations with other countries, in the major field of struggle against the imperialist war and for a people's peace.

When the enemy seeks to destroy us by brazenly misrepresenting our Party as serving "foreign" interests, what they really fear is this: though still relatively a small party, we are an *effective* party, effective in the struggle of the American people *for the best interests of the masses and of the nation.* We are the vanguard party of the American working class—a party of Lenin and Stalin; a party which is championing a way of social life that is today being realized on more than one-

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

sixth of the earth by the tremendous power of the Soviet Union; a party whose line of struggle for a people's peace is based not on mere wishes but on powerful forces among the American people, among its potential allies in colonial and dependent countries where important Communist Parties are making significant contributions to this same general line, and on the peace policies of the great and ever-growing might of the Soviet Union.

Our program of struggle for a people's peace is also based upon powerful forces among the peoples of the belligerent countries and of former belligerents, like France, where Communist Parties are fighting for the same general line of peace, each in their own way. The Communist Party of Germany, consistently opposing the war and German imperialism, has bravely raised in its own country the banner of a people's peace, against predatory conquests and annexations by German imperialism, a peace based on self-determination and free agreements of peoples, as demonstrated by the Soviet Union. It is fighting consistently against its "own" imperialism, thus building power for the peace of the peoples, for international working class solidarity.

The Communist Party of England, which is celebrating its twentieth anniversary, is mobilizing the masses against the predatory war of British imperialism, raising the banner of a true anti-imperialist defense of the nation, against the criminals of Munichism, for proletarian solidarity with the working classes, especially of Germany and France.

And the Communist Party of France, always with the French people in their sorrows as well as joys, has raised high the banner of a regenerated France, free of traitors, exploiters and conquerors, to be realized in a new way and by new methods. Thus another great force is accumulating for a people's peace, not only for France but for all peoples.

Thus the working-class international line for a people's peace is realizing itself in each of these countries, as well as in Italy and all others. It is realizing itself in the measure in which the masses in the capitalist world are developing active support to the peace policies of the Soviet Union, rallying ever more closely around this greatest and most powerful bulwark of peace, progress and socialism.

It is for all these manifold reasons that our message carries a powerful appeal to the masses while arousing the howling anger of the imperialists and reactionaries. This is why the Communist Party of the United States—despite its small numbers—is able to work *effectively* for the good of the American working class, for the good of all common people, for the good of the American nation.

Going to the people in this election struggle, the Communist Party is able to bring forward not only its program and policies but also *its record of deeds.*

A. B.

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

ELECTION PLATFORM OF THE COMMUNIST PARTY OF THE U.S.A., 1940

BASIC POLITICAL OUTLINE FOR THE PLATFORM*

BY EARL BROWDER

ALMOST three years ago there were words uttered which, in taking up the question of formulating a people's program for peace and prosperity, I wish to quote:

"In our generation, a new idea has come to dominate thought about government—the idea that the resources of the nation can be made to produce a far higher standard of living for the masses if only government is intelligent and energetic in giving the right direction to economic life. That idea . . . cannot be thrust aside by those who want to go back to the conditions of ten years ago or even preserve the conditions of today. It puts all forms of government to proof."

The masses of the people have not abandoned this idea, nor have the Communists abandoned it, but the man who spoke those words in 1937 now talks a different language, he now says that everything must be subordinated to the goal of fifty thousand airplanes and a multiplied navy. A program of armaments for imperialist adventures abroad cancels out the program for "a far higher standard of living for the masses."

Therefore, the people's platform must begin with the fight to keep America out of the war, the fight against all policies which call for great armaments.

The most immediate menace of war for America is the call for moral support to the British and French Empires, is the already-deep economic involvement, which combine to push and pull the American people, against their will, into belligerent support.

Therefore, the people's platform must declare to both imperialist camps, German and Allied, "A plague on both your houses!" It must stop the blood-soaked trade in munitions and instruments of war. It must declare to the whole world, so that there shall be no encouragement of false hopes, that "The Yanks are not coming."

Industrial and agricultural production for a war market gives immense fortunes to a few men; for the nation as a whole it produces

* Excerpts from the Report to the Eleventh National Convention of the Communist Party of the United States, held in New York, May 30 to June 2 1940.

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

disaster. War profits and the prospect of war profits cause the extension of monopoly and a sharp rise in prices, bringing disorder into the economy and misery to the people. Those who are seeking immediate riches from the war are in the forefront in breaking down American neutrality. To resist the clamor for war profits requires the unswerving effort of all Americans who love peace.

Therefore, the people's platform must demand that during the existence of war conditions abroad the Government shall place the most drastic taxation upon profits, to guarantee that the burden of taxation shall be placed where it shall least disturb the general standard of living, and that the monopolists and profiteers shall be deprived of their motive for endangering the lives, peace and prosperity of the people.

Finance capital's invasion of the Latin American countries is endangering the peaceful relations between them and the United States, as exemplified by the efforts of the Roosevelt Administration, at the behest of the oil trust, to dictate the inner affairs of Mexico, and to interfere in their elections. The United States, by holding Puerto Rico and the Philippine Islands as colonies, not only oppresses these peoples but also thereby worsens American conditions, and further endangers peace.

Therefore, the people's platform must call for a united struggle together with the peoples of Latin America and the Philippines to resist and curb the power of American big banks, trusts, and speculalators abroad, to eliminate their dictation of American policy, to secure full independence to Puerto Rico and the Philippines, and jointly to resist and defeat those who would drag the Americas into the war.

Thus the people's platform will point the way which alone can throw back all the forces making for war, and open the way for the full development of the domestic measures necessary for achieving prosperity, a far higher standard of living for the masses. . . .

The capitalist bankers and financial experts may be able to confuse the minds of the people, when they discuss the problem in terms of the hocus-pocus of monopoly finance capital. But go behind the banker and his ledgers. Look at the country and its people. We have a broad and rich land, and competent farmers on it, capable of producing enough food each year to feed 300,000,000 people instead of 130,000,000. It has unlimited reserves of almost every raw material needed for our economy, and skilled workers begging for the opportunity to produce twice as much as they now do. We have the highest-developed industry in the world, with power, machinery, and capable workers, the product of which could be doubled or tripled within the year, if only it were called upon for such production. We have marvelous scientific laboratories and scientific workers, whose latest discoveries and inventions, now languishing unused and undeveloped because of

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

the crisis, could transform the whole life of the people and again double their productive capacities. We have everything conceivable in the mind of man that is necessary to provide a life of comfort and plenty for the whole population.

Why, O gentlemen who hold the title deeds of ownership of these marvelous productive forces of America, at whose beck and call stand millions of the most skilled and capable workers the world has ever seen, why do you say that this country and this people cannot afford to go to work producing everything the country needs? Explain it to us more simply, you rich and wise and good gentlemen in whose stewardship America with all its marvelous riches has been placed! Why is it that America can afford twelve million idle workers; can afford forty million ill-housed, ill-clad and ill-fed men, women, and children, can afford mines, mills, and factories closed down and rusting; can afford billions of capital lying idle in the banks; can afford accumulating agricultural surpluses, and to pay farmers to produce less; can afford to play with the idea of war, and can spend many billions preparing for war—but such a country cannot, you say, afford to put these men to work, to put these idle resources to work, because it would bankrupt us? Why? Why?

Explain this riddle if you can, you statesmen and intellectual servitors of the capitalist class. Perhaps, if we can force you to try to explain this riddle to the workers and farmers of America, they will begin to see that there is nothing wrong with the productive resources of our country, there is nothing wrong with the workers and farmers of our country, but that the whole trouble arises from you and your masters, the monopolists, the economic royalists, who stand as a barrier between the people, the workers and farmers, and the country's economy, and refuse to allow them to come together for the enrichment of the country, because you first must have your profit, a constantly increasing profit which is dragging the people deeper and deeper into unemployment, misery, poverty—and now into war!

No, the one thing America can no longer afford is this insane and catastrophic crushing of the lives of the millions who *are* America.

The workers and farmers, the majority of Americans, already see this problem, dimly as yet but with rapidly growing clarity, and the way out along the lines of the people's program which we have outlined.

It will be the main task of the Communist Party in the 1940 election campaign to make the whole people conscious of the problem, and of the road toward its solution. We must, we will, we can succeed in this task!

The People's Platform for Democracy and Civil Rights

We speak very much of the people. When we say "the people," however, we do not mean each and every one of the population taken as a whole. That would be nonsense, because it would be to say that "the people" are poor and "the people"

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

are rich; that "the people" want peace and "the people" want war; that "the people" are exploited, and "the people" are exploiters, and so on. *So, in order to make any sense, to find any path, we must distinguish between the people and the enemies of the people.* First of all, who are the enemies of the people? I turn for a quotation to a formerly very popular authority:

"We have those who really fear the majority rule of democracy, who want old forms of economic and social control to remain in a few hands. They say in their hearts: 'If constitutional democracy continues to threaten our control, why should we be against the plutocratic dictatorship which would perpetuate our control?'"

Yes, this is a correct indication of who are the chief enemies of the people. They are those "few" in whose hands rest "old forms of economic and social control," those who have become known as "economic royalists" or "the sixty families"; they are the finance capitalists, and together with their smaller scale satellites and lieutenants of many sorts, make up the bourgeoisie, the "upper class." The man whose words I have just quoted is himself of this bourgeoisie, of its more aristocratic strata, and was called "a traitor to his class" when he was indulging in those orations which aroused the masses to considerable enthusiasm; but since that time he has rejoined his class, those who want a plutocratic dictatorship, and has himself joined in that aim. The philippic of the Roosevelt of 1937 describes the Roosevelt of 1940.

These enemies of the people, enemies of democracy, are now clamping down their open and brutal dictatorship. Like all their prototypes in other lands, they proceed under the flag of "the fight against Communism" (remember the Anti-Comintern Pact of Hitler-Mussolini-Franco-the Mikado!), which immediately spreads out to include the whole labor movement and all oppositional trends. They have already adopted a law prohibiting Communists from relief, and from private as well as public employment. How many votes could the Republican Party obtain if there were such a law directed against it? How long will it be before such laws produce a full-fledged fascist regime in America? The attacks against the Communist Party have already broadened to include most of the labor movement, and three to four million foreign-born workers.

Even before the latest war hysteria, however, and as a long-standing part of "the American democratic way of life," our country has suffered from the effective cancellation of democracy through the disfranchisement of the great majority of the Southern people, white and Negro, workers and farmers. This is done through poll-tax laws and direct franchise limitations, as well as through direct violence and lynch law. . . .

Therefore, the people's platform for peace and prosperity must be buttressed by a broad and well-organized struggle for the protection and extension of civil liberties and

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

popular rights. Definite goals must be set for this struggle, such as:

Defeat every attempt to restrict freedom of speech, press, radio, and assembly, and the right to organize and strike.

Rouse the great masses to halt the attacks upon the trade unions through Anti-Trust Law indictments and "conspiracy" charges.

Demand the immediate enactment of the Federal Anti-Lynching Bill, which has been so shamefully pigeonholed by Congress and the Administration.

Secure the franchise to the Southern masses, white and Negro, by immediate federal legislation prohibiting and penalizing all poll-tax laws, and other limitations on the franchise, as a *national issue*, not a regional Southern issue, without the solution of which there is no effective democracy for the whole nation.

Abolition of all discriminatory legislation and customs directed against the Negro population; unconditional equality, economic, political and social.

Defeat all the anti-alien legislation, and the so-called sedition laws, which are a modern resurrection in a worse form of the ancient Alien and Seditions Laws of the Adams Administration, in the fight against which Thomas Jefferson established American democracy, in the fight against which today this democracy can alone be preserved.

Defeat the attacks against the Communist Party, which constitute a knife at the throat of the Bill of Rights for the whole population.

Defend the Bill of Rights, which is even more important in time of war than in time of peace, which is a guarantee for all or is valid for none.

In this fight for popular rights, the working class is the main and leading force, which must unite itself, and gather the masses of the people around it, to defeat the enemies of the people. The working class, and especially the organized labor movement, is the heart and backbone, is the organizer and leader of the democratic mass movement of the people.

This platform of the fight for peace, for economic security and prosperity and for civil rights, a fight, which has to be won against the determined attacks of the "upper classes," of the economic royalists and their agents, is denounced by President Roosevelt and his associates as a "harmful class struggle" which he is determined to abolish. But if the struggle of the workers, farmers, and toiling masses is to be abolished, first of all the attacks against their peace, their living standards, and their liberties must be stopped. No one who leads in these attacks can abolish the defense and resistance of the masses, no matter how much he shouts against the "class struggle." The class struggle is not something invented by the Communists or the working class, it is a struggle imposed upon us by the rich, the overprivileged, the economic royalists, and their course of exploitation, oppression, reaction and war.

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Possible Future Extensions of the People's Platform

The immediate platform which we have outlined does not go beyond the limits of the capitalist system in its economic aspects, while it is merely the realization of the promises of bourgeois democracy in its political aspects. It is not a revolutionary program, therefore, in the sense that it is not a program of socialism nor is it socialistic.

But America is already entering the period in which the broad masses are already discussing whether it is possible to accept capitalist orthodoxy as the rigid limitations of all measures in their interest.

For instance, it is not only the Communists, but tens of millions of workers and farmers who ponder over the mysteries of the question why twelve million idle workers should be *forbidden* by the government to produce anything which would compete with a private capitalist, no matter how much the twelve million lack that same thing; or the question how is it that starvation and poverty are to be relieved by paying farmers to reduce their production. The question will not down; why not put the twelve million to work producing more abundantly the things they and the farmers need, and pay the farmers to produce more, not less? This, we know, the capitalists cannot do, but if so, why not the government? And the only answer to this is, that to do so would violate the economic laws of capitalism.

For the masses, the economic laws of capitalism are therefore not so sacred as they were formerly. If these economic laws of capitalism are preventing the workers and farmers from solving their problems, then has the time not come to go beyond those economic laws and begin to find some new laws?

These are the questions that bring America to the edge of the problem of socialism; measures that already begin to go beyond the limitations of the economic laws of capitalism will more and more be demanded by the masses of the people. Such measures are the first beginning of a socialist trend in the proper and exact sense of the word.

The more the reactionaries and warmongers sabotage and defeat the more conservative demands of the masses, the more they are hastening, not delaying, the time when the masses will pass from more radical and socialistic thought to action in the same sense and direction. That will furnish the transition phase, in which the toiling masses will go to school in their millions to the Communists, to learn the lessons of the permanent solution of the problems of poverty and war.

To further this process in the most systematic manner is not the least of the tasks of the Communist Party in 1940. To accomplish it is to introduce America into the higher school of political education, on the basis of its own experience, to introduce the millions to the problems of socialism as the first stage of communism. . . .

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

ELECTION PLATFORM OF THE COMMUNIST PARTY OF THE U.S.A.

THE life, liberty and the pursuit of happiness of the American people are now endangered as never before since our revolutionary forefathers one hundred and sixty-four years ago proclaimed these rights to be inalienable for all mankind.

For the flower of American youth, the right to life itself is challenged by those who claim the privilege to conscript them and to throw them into reactionary wars for the benefit of the propertied classes.

For the American people as a whole, their liberty is challenged by projects of conscription of even the civilian population, of tens of millions of workers of factories and farms—ostensibly for the security of the country, but really for the purpose of setting aside the sacred guarantees of our Bill of Rights and placing the civilian population under military law, to free the hands of ruling financiers for military adventures and conquest abroad.

For our country, as for the peoples of all the world, the pursuit of happiness can be realized only with work, with security against unemployment, against poverty in old age, with guaranteed education for the youth—and with a genuine policy of peace. But with 11,000,000 Americans unemployed, the Democratic Party Administration is sacrificing all social legislation, unemployment relief, unemployment and old-age insurance, and educational guarantees for the youth, in order to pour all resources of the nation as well as the blood of our people into the scramble of monopoly capital for domination of the world.

Wall Street Wants War

The predatory war unleashed by the imperialist ruling classes of Berlin, London, Paris, Rome and Tokyo is a worldwide struggle for the division of the world among imperialist bandits—a struggle for the right of capitalist imperialist exploitation of the world by sacrificing the freedom of all peoples and the national independence of all nations.

Therefore the richest and most predatory of international bankers and trust heads of the whole world —those of Wall Street—are determined to enter into this worldwide, military contest in order to claim for themselves a share in proportion to their gigantic wealth. While their war profits pile high they deliberately seek to prolong the war and feverishly prepare to enter it. They have already transformed our country into an arsenal for one side of the predatory European conflict, and into a chief source of war materials for the Japanese adventures in Asia—thus making the United States, while still a non-belligerent, nevertheless a participant in the worldwide military conflict.

The warmongers of Wall Street are feverishly preparing to establish through military might the exclusive role of American finance capital over the two American continents

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

at the sacrifice of the independence of twenty republics of Latin America. They are striving to strengthen their imperialist positions in China and aim toward control of the Dutch East Indies (Indonesia) in struggle for mastery of the Pacific.

Aspiring for world domination, the American finance capitalists strive to drag the American people into the European war on the side of Great Britain. They work for a continuation and extension of that war and share guilt for the fate of those countries already conquered in Europe, Asia and Africa. But the same American imperialists have not closed the door to possible temporary agreements with the German and Japanese conquerors for establishment of the "new orders" in Europe and Asia, if only the terms be advantageous to the bankers of Wall Street.

Just as the American imperialists applauded and supported the betrayal of the democracy of Europe in the Pact of Munich, so are they ready now, on the promise of a gain to themselves, to betray the people of the United States, the peoples of the twenty Latin American republics, and those of Asia and of all of Europe and Africa to new imperialist agreements—if only they can secure their monopolist domination through the suppression of American democracy under blanket conscription and M-Day laws.

The Democratic and Republican parties—twin parties of the financiers of Wall Street—are seeking in this election to goad the people into a war hysteria, into panic and confusion, and to induce the people to agree to a surrender of constitutional democracy to a virtual military dictatorship in time of peace. All war plans are dressed in the disguise of peace plans. All plans for dangerous military adventures are given the gentle name of "national security." All projects for military aggression are entitled "national defense plans." All imperialist ventures for subjecting the Latin American republics are entitled "protecting the Western Hemisphere." Every prospective imperialist venture and "Munich" arrangement designed to throw the American people into war and to sacrifice the independence of Latin American peoples are brought forward under slogans of "peace" and "democracy" as was the treaty of Munich.

The People Want Peace

All domestic policies defended or proposed in this election by the Democratic and Republican parties are domestic policies subordinated to and completely dominated by the common purpose of American finance capital, the economic royalists, to plunge this country into a worldwide military struggle for conquest. This fundamental and decisive agreement between the Sixty Families of Wall Street that control both the Democratic and Republican parties, on a foreign policy of aggressive and militaristic imperialism, has brought the Democratic and the Republican parties to strangely harmonious positions on

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

domestic policies. Both have common class interests and objectives. The differences between the two parties arise from specific secondary rivalries and conflicts among great financial interests as to division of the spoils, as well as from the traditional rivalry between the Ins and the Outs, and from partisan bureaucratic interests incidental to the two-party system of American capitalism.

The bogus Socialist Party and other Social-Democratic groups and leaders, like their counterparts in Europe, Blum, Citrine and Tanner, play the role of treacherous agents of the warmongers in labor's ranks. They beat the drums for war and strive to paralyze labor toward this goal, they lead the reactionary pack for a "holy crusade" against the land of socialism and peace, the Soviet Union. They perform a special task for reaction in its assault upon the democratic rights of our people.

The top leadership of the A. F. of L., the Hillman wing of the C.I.O. leadership and the leadership of the Railroad Brotherhoods have committed themselves to the "defense" program of the Roosevelt Administration and are attempting to subordinate the labor movement to Wall Street's war program.

All these parties are in opposition to the will of the majority of the American people. The overwhelming majority of our people are opposed to the entrance of our country into this predatory war. The overwhelming majority stand for the preservation and enlarging of social and progressive legislation, for unemployment insurance, old-age pensions, public works, farmer and youth aid, and for full civil liberties.

Only the Communist Party, among the political parties participating in the 1940 elections, fights on the side of and in harmony with the deepest desires of the majority of the people. The Communist Party alone of all political parties fights against the imperialist war, combats its prolongation and spread, and seeks to bring an end to the war.

Only the Communist Party opposes the imperialist policies of the economic royalists, their government and parties. The Communist Party is for a people's peace, and opposed to an imperialist peace based upon terror, annexations and oppression.

We want to keep our country out of the imperialist war. We want to ensure jobs and social security for all. We want to protect the Bill of Rights. We are opposed to imperialist ventures abroad, against M-Day plans and the militarization of our country.

The economic royalists once again have full domination over the Republican and Democratic parties.

In the name of "national unity" and "national defense" the Roosevelt Democrats have surrendered to the economic royalists. The ruling class is attempting to suppress the people's opposition to its war program through terror, attacks upon organized labor and with vicious alien and sedition laws.

The Roosevelt Democrats make

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

every effort to retain support of the people on grounds of progressive labor and social legislation enacted in the past seven years, but the Roosevelt Administration has thrown overboard even the meager popular gains of the New Deal and has embraced the program of the Liberty League which was roundly rejected by the people in the 1936 election. This has been done on the ground that all national resources must be poured into war preparations, and in order to put through this unpopular war they find it necessary to fight the people's demands.

While playing for popular support with ambiguous phrases about differences, the Willkie-Hoover Republicans have joined hands with the reactionary Democratic Party leadership in championing the pro-war foreign policy and undemocratic domestic measures of the Roosevelt Administration. Republican advocacy of the interests of Wall Street may be more open and outspoken, but it is not more effective than that of the Roosevelt Democrats.

The gains which labor and the American people won by organization and struggle during the New Deal period are now under a concerted attack.

After eight years of New Deal "liberalism," just as in 1933 after twelve years of Republican "rugged individualism," the misery and poverty of the working people under capitalism is growing.

Eleven million Americans are denied the right to work. A huge armaments program for imperialist conquest and war has been substituted for the former meager work and relief program.

Millions of small farmers, sharecroppers and tenant farmers are impoverished, and are being driven from their land by banks and insurance companies, and by the Federal and state governments.

Big business strives to crush the labor and anti-war movements by F.B.I. and Dies Committee persecutions, by attacks upon the National Labor Relations Act, the Wages and Hours Law and through a renewed open-shop offensive.

The youth of America, deprived of a decent education and the right to work, face conscription and being turned into cannon fodder by the merchants of death.

The Negro people, most exploited of the toilers, suffering from lynching and Jim Crowism, robbed of their constitutional rights, are being prepared to fight another war for "democracy" in order to further enslave them.

Millions of innocent and industrious foreign-born immigrants, who have given their all to the development of America, are being harassed and persecuted with fingerprinting and registration as if common criminals.

Wall Street girds for war by striving to destroy the Bill of Rights, by attacking the civil rights of Communists and other anti-war fighters, by promoting red-baiting, labor disunity and religious prejudices, by smearing as "fifth columnists" and "foreign agents" all who

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

love peace, liberty and democracy.

This is the plight of the common people under the rule of the Sixty Families. This is the type of "democracy" represented by the Democratic and Republican parties.

A People's Program

In this grave hour of crisis, the Communist Party calls upon the working class and toilers to close ranks, organize and unite around a common program of action to protect and advance the peace, liberties and welfare of our people, to defend the interests of our nation, the interests of the American people.

The Communist Party calls upon all opponents of imperialist war and capitalist reaction to establish unity of action, under labor's leadership, around a people's program to defend our country, for peace, jobs, security and civil liberties. Towards this end the Communist Party enters the election campaign with the following program of action:

Keep America out of the imperialist war!

Halt the war preparations and imperialist adventures of Wall Street and the Government!

Against the militarization of the nation!

For a people's peace!

1. Combat the imperialist policies and acts of the President, the State Department, Congress, the Democratic and Republican parties to spread the war and involve the United States in it. No aid to the imperialist war-makers in London, Berlin, Tokyo, Rome or to their satellites. Oppose all war loans and credits to the warring imperialist powers. Stop the sale and shipment of munitions and armaments to the imperialist belligerents.

2. Defeat Wall Street's imperialist policy of economic and political domination, and military adventures in Latin America, China, and the Dutch East Indies (Indonesia). Full solidarity with the anti-imperialist struggles of the peoples of Mexico, Cuba, and all other Latin American countries. For the immediate and complete national independence of the Philippines and Puerto Rico. Maximum support for the great Chinese people in their heroic struggle for national liberation. Halt the anti-Soviet policies and incitements of the government and Wall Street. For friendship and collaboration for peace between the two great peoples of the United States and the Soviet Union.

3. No armaments or American soldiers for imperialist wars or adventures. Democratize the armed forces. Protect the freedom and independence of the trade unions. Make the rich pay the costs of the war preparations and the economic crisis for which they are responsible. Fight against war profiteering.

4. Against a peace of "appeasement." Against an imperialist peace of violence and oppression. For solidarity with and support to the peoples in the warring nations in their struggle for a democratic people's peace.

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Protect and Extend Civil Liberties! Full Rights for the Negro People!

1. For the unrestricted freedom of speech, press, radio, assembly and worship, and the full right to organize, strike and picket. Defeat the anti-labor drive under the Sherman Anti-Trust Law. Pass the La-Follette-Thomas Oppressive Labor Practices Bill without reactionary amendments. Stop the attacks upon labor by the F.B.I. and the Department of Justice.

2. Pass the Geyer Anti-Poll Tax Bill to give the vote to the Negro and the white masses in the South. For full civil rights and the right to vote for all men in the armed services, migratory workers and seafaring men.

3. Guarantee the Negro people complete equality, equal rights to jobs, equal pay for equal work, the full right to organize, serve on juries and hold public office. Pass the Anti-Lynching Bill. Demand the death penalty for lynchers. Enforce the 13th, 14th and 15th Amendments to the United States Constitution.

4. End the dictatorial powers of the Dies and other Congressional anti-labor investigating committees. Repeal the vicious anti-alien and sedition laws that are a blot on the statute books of a free people. Put an end to anti-Semitism. Guarantee the traditional American right of asylum to all victims of imperialist war and oppression, especially to the refugees from Franco Spain.

5. Guarantee the civil rights and freedom of action of labor, including the Communists, and all other anti-war, anti-imperialist organizations. Against all reactionary measures requiring the registration, incorporation or Federal control of working class political organizations, trade unions and other popular organizations. For the freedom of all working class political prisoners now languishing in Federal and state prisons. Defend the Bill of Rights against the reactionaries and war-makers.

Jobs, Security and an American Standard of Living for All Toilers!

Protect the Farmers From Wall Street!

Protect the Rights and Interests of the American Youth!

Curb the Monopolists!

1. For the organization of the unorganized. For higher wages and the thirty-hour week without reduction in pay. For equal rights for Negro workers, the foreign born, women and youth labor. Abolish the wage differential between North and South. Abolish child labor. Cancel all government orders to those employers who fail to comply with labor legislation.

2. For a Federal housing program providing for building a minimum of a million homes annually for the low-income groups. Expand W.P.A. to provide work for all unemployed with a minimum of 3,000,000 jobs to be provided immediately on socially beneficial projects, at union wage rates. Increase the present wage scale by 30 per cent and make as minimum payment for any classification $70 monthly. Extend unem-

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

ployment insurance to cover domestic, agricultural and all wage earners not now covered by the law. Increase minimum benefit payments to $10 weekly. Increase maximum payments from one-half to two-thirds of wages earned. Extend the period of unemployment compensation payments from the present maximum of thirteen weeks to twenty-six weeks.

3. Establish an *old-age pension* system providing $60 monthly for all over sixty. Enact an adequate Federal health program and a sysem of maternity insurance. Guarantee free education to all youth and children, Negro and white, by extending Federal and state appropriations.

4. Guarantee to all farmers their land, equipment, and livestock free from seizure. Free the working farmers and sharecroppers from debt, tax burdens and foreclosures. Provide a high homestead tax-exemption and heavier taxes on large farms. For a Homestead Act for Today to return all lands confiscated by the Federal, state, and local governments, by the banks and insurance companies to all small farmers, tenants and sharecroppers dispossessed from the land and who wish to engage in farming. Develop an adequate program of tenant rehabilitation, soil conservation and drought relief. Guarantee the cost of production to the family-sized farm. Provide Federal funds for direct farm relief so that no farm family shall lack the necessities of life. Establish a ten-year debt moratorium for the small-income farmers.

5. Extend the N.Y.A. and the C.C.C. under civilian control and on civilian projects at trade union standards. Adopt the American Youth Act.

6. Prosecute the trusts and monopolies for profiteering, monopoly practices, nullifying labor legislation, evading taxes and violating the laws of the land. Establish a heavy excess profits tax and a steeply graduated income tax on the higher brackets. Abolish tax-exempt securities. Confiscate all war profits. Repeal the provisions of the new tax laws hitting the low-income groups. Abolish all direct and indirect taxes on articles of mass consumption.

For a National Farmer-Labor Party

This is an anti-imperialist program of struggle for peace, real national defense, and social security. It can be realized by labor and the toiling people through organization and united struggle, by building and strengthening the trade unions, and other progressive organizations of labor, and by promoting independent political action of labor and the common people, leading towards the building up of a united mass party—a national farmer-labor party, an anti-imperialist third party of the people.

The struggle for such a united people's party for peace, security and civil liberties can be actively promoted in the November elections by voting for and supporting the

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Communist Party. It can be effectively developed by establishing unity of action by the workers in all unions and industries in defense of their immediate economic and political demands. It can be strengthened by supporting tested anti-war and labor candidates for Congress and state legislatures.

Capitalism has brought our people only tyranny, hunger, degradation and war. Capitalism has given us an ever-deepening crisis, with millions permanently unemployed. Capitalism is destroying the cultural achievements and constitutional guarantees of freedom provided in the Bill of Rights. Under capitalism the people face a hopeless future. Only when capitalism is abolished, when socialism is established, as today in the U.S.S.R., will there be no wars, no unemployment, no social retrogression. Under socialism there will be abundance and security for the toiling people. To make our country really free, united and prosperous—to make it possible for all the people to benefit from the tremendous resources of our country—demands a new social order in which the national economy will belong to the people—a socialist society. Only in a nation free from its monopoly and financial overlords and freed of bondage to the few who have seized its wealth and oppress its people can our people live and flourish.

The Communist Party fights for the immediate interests of the working class, as well as its socialist future. We pledge to continue our struggle for our socialist aim, the common goal of all progressive mankind, already triumphant over one-sixth of the earth.

Vote Communist!

Workers! Toilers! The Democratic Party is the party of the Roosevelts and Dies, of the Garners and Woodrums, of the du Ponts and Cromwells, of the Boss Hagues and Kelleys, of Tammany and the K.K.K. It is the party of "liberal" promises and reactionary deeds.

The Republican Party is the party of the Willkies and Hoovers, the Vandenbergs and Fords, of the Insulls, Weirs and Girdlers. It is the party of the Associated Farmers and the open shoppers.

The Morgans, Rockefellers and du Ponts are the Interlocking Directorate and Holding Company of both the Democratic and Republican parties. That is why *both parties* are war parties, M-Day parties, parties of imperialism, reaction and hunger.

This is why labor and the people cannot and must not vote for nor support the Democratic or the Republican parties, or their little brother, the Socialist Party.

That is why the working class and toilers should vote for and support the Communist Party.

A vote for the Communist Party is a vote against the imperialist war, against Wall Street's imperialist adventures and war preparations, for safeguarding the peace of America and defending the national interests of the American people.

A vote for the Communist Party is a vote for peace, freedom and socialism. Vote Communist! Vote for Browder and Ford!

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

THE PAN-AMERICAN CONFERENCE IN HAVANA

BY WILLIAM Z. FOSTER

THE Second Consultative Meeting of Ministers of Foreign Affairs of the American Republics, held under the aegis of the Pan-American Union in Havana, Cuba, July 21-30, was a battleground of imperialist powers—the United States, Great Britain, Germany—for control of Latin America. The prize at stake is a rich one. The twenty Latin American Republics stretch over a territory almost three times as large as the United States and have a population of about 123,000,000. They are enormously rich in raw materials and agricultural products. Central and South America constitute the largest and richest stretch of country in the world not dominated by any one great power. They are a tempting morsel indeed for rapacious imperialists.

In Havana, American imperialism carried the day, not completely but substantially, against its German and British imperialist rivals and against considerable resistance from the Latin American peoples. It made progress in chaining Latin America to its war chariot. Its victory did not advance the cause, however, of world peace and democracy. But the energetic fight of Yankee imperialism to dominate Latin America is by no means won. The decisive struggles still lie ahead, and they will not be slow in developing.

I.

The Forces in Struggle at Havana

(a) *American Imperialism*

The United States Government organized the Havana Conference in order to further its intensified offensive to subjugate Latin America and to link up this great territory with its war program. During the economic crisis and the early Roosevelt period the American Government had been less active, after the militant imperialism of the Harding-Coolidge-Hoover days. Its present offensive got under way immediately after the war began between the Allies and Germany. President Roosevelt, patching up his quarrel with Wall Street, scrapped the New Deal and its equivalent in Latin America, the Good Neighbor policy, and became the war leader of

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

American imperialism. A central point in this program was to strengthen the position of American imperialism in Latin America while the two main enemies, British and German imperialism, were locked together in a death struggle.

An intense trade drive was launched in Latin America, which increased American exports to those countries 50 per cent in the first four months of this year. Besides this, at the Pan-American Conference held in Panama in September, 1939, American pressure was instrumental in lining up all the Latin American republics, at least formally, behind Roosevelt's so-called neutrality, and in establishing the famous three-hundred-mile "chastity belt" around this continent. Meanwhile, the American press and radio, suddenly grown acutely Latin American conscious, seethed with plans for American control of Central and South America. In Congress the clamor grew to make Great Britain and France turn over their island colonies in the Western Hemisphere to the United States in payment of their defaulted war debts, or to provide the basis for new war credits. Colonel Lindbergh boldly demanded United States hegemony over all the Americas, and Colonel Knox restated Roosevelt's assertion that the Caribbean Sea is an American lake.

The great Nazi offensive on the Western Front, culminating in the downfall of France, enormously stimulated the already intense drive of American imperialism in Latin America. Painting horrendous pictures of an impending Nazi invasion of the Americas, the warmongers of both capitalist parties demanded armed "defense" of this hemisphere. Some powerful financial groups, however, because of appeasement tendencies and alleging military unpreparedness, wanted the United States to confine its efforts to the territory north of the "bulge" of South America. They pointed out the greater economic and military difficulties for the United States the farther one goes south. But the Administration and the main Wall Street forces are obviously aiming at controlling both continents completely. Willkie is no less an imperialist than Roosevelt. Germany is trying to seize all Europe, and Japan seeks to occupy entire Eastern Asia, why then, they reason, should not the United States grab the whole Western Hemisphere during the war while the grabbing is good? The imperialist slogans "for an American League of Nations," "for a greater America," actually signify, as *Pravda* recently said, "America for the United States."

The Roosevelt Administration is basing its gigantic militarization program upon this grandiose imperialist scheme of conquering all of Latin America. Conscription in the United States; 50,000 airplanes; the two-ocean navy; M-Day regimentation of the American people; fifteen billion dollars in military appropriations by the present Congress; the famous continental economic cartel; the projected air and naval bases in the Caribbean, Brazil, Chile, Argentina, Greenland and Canada; the Pan-American highway; the $500,-

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

000,000 in additional funds for the Export-Import Bank; the formation of the Inter-American Bank; the making of loans to Brazil, Argentina and Chile—are all phases of the great plan to reduce Latin America to a system of colonies of the United States. It was in the spirit of this reactionary program, of its big drive to subjugate Latin America, that the United States entered the Havana Conference.

(b) *British Imperialism*

Great Britain was on the defensive at Havana. With some six billion dollars of investments and a big trade in Latin America to guard, it had for several years been slowly slipping under the growing pressure of American and German imperialism. The outbreak of the war increased its difficulties. Although the British imperialists greeted the Havana Conference with formal words of friendliness, these words did not disguise the fear and hostility with which they regarded it. They realized quite well that their "friend," the United States, was cold-bloodedly trying to oust them from Latin America.

(c) *German Imperialism*

Germany and its fascist collaborators, the Italian, Spanish and Japanese imperialists, notwithstanding their own conflicting interests, viewed the Havana Conference with open hostility and did all they could to disrupt it. On its eve they showered the Latin American countries with threats and promises, in order to stiffen their resistance against advancing American imperialism. Although German imperialism had no outspoken defenders in the Conference, its influence was potent in slowing down the militant Americans. For the moment the interests of German imperialism dovetailed with those of British imperialism in opposing the United States at the Conference.

Prior to the war the Nazis had begun an aggressive campaign to dominate Latin America economically and politically. This resulted in greatly increasing German trade with the countries below the South American "bulge," mostly at England's expense. On the basis of this, the German imperialists had developed strong alliances with local reactionaries. Besides, through its strong, strategically situated business and diplomatic agents, in these lands, German imperialism had also strengthened its political position. In Brazil, the Nazis attempted in 1938 to overthrow the Vargas Government. In Argentina they plotted to seize Patagonia. In Peru they sought to upset the Benevides regime. In Bolivia their stooges actually secured power. The Italians, also strong in several countries, supported this general line of the Nazis. So did the newly-fledged Franco-Spanish imperialists, who are dreaming of the reconquest of the lost Spanish colonies and whose Falangist organizations have expanded in many of the republics. Hitler announced that he was going to establish a New Germany in South America, and Mussolini declared that the frontiers of the Axis were at the Panama Canal.

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

The outbreak of the war checked somewhat these ambitious fascist imperialist schemings. With England dominating the sea lanes, German trade with Latin America collapsed and Nazi political influence also waned considerably. To offset militant American imperialism, however, Germany recently concluded many trade deals in Latin America, promising deliveries this fall. As the Havana Conference loomed Hitler tried to counteract it by making glowing promises to the Latin Americas to the effect that Nazi-dominated Europe would buy up all their economic surpluses, especially meat, hides, coffee and oil, for which there is no market in the United States. Then, as a further measure to prevent the various republics from becoming tied up with American monopolist trade agreements, Hitler, through his Minister of Economics Funk, made the sinister threat that Germany would trade either "with twenty-one sovereign South American states or not at all." These mingled Nazi promises and threats were not without effect in slowing down American imperialism in the Havana Conference.

(d) *The Latin American Republics*

Faced by powerful American imperialism, the Latin American peoples were at a big disadvantage in Havana and they yielded much ground. For one thing, as heavy exporters of raw materials to Europe, they had largely lost their markets because of the war. Great surpluses of export commodities were piling up in the various countries, especially south of the "bulge," and they hoped at the Conference to find some release for them in American markets. As for the Caribbean countries, which normally ship from 60 per cent to 80 per cent of their exports to the United States, they were also in a weak position economically to fight the Colossus of the North.

The Latin American countries were between two great pressures. First, there was the growing fear (which the Americans did all possible to stimulate) of a Nazi invasion of Latin America supported by fascist insurrections within. Then there was the more immediate fear of American imperialism which, through press and radio, was brazenly telling the Latin Americas that they must either accept Hull's proposals or take the consequences. The sending of an American cruiser to Uruguay and Brazil gave point to the many current threats that the United States was determined to enforce its will in Latin America by arms if necessary.

Together with these fears, there were also among the Latin American peoples many illusions to the effect that Roosevelt's policy was based on good intentions for Latin America. These illusions made it easier for the American delegation to carry the day at Havana, and did much to prevent the opposition from crystallizing in the Conference. The fact has not yet penetrated home in Latin America that Roosevelt, reconciled with Wall Street, has quite abandoned his erstwhile liberal Good Neighbor policy and is now applying a ruthlessly imperialist version of the Monroe Doctrine. It is a policy that looks toward the

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

economic, political and military domination of all Latin America by Wall Street.

Another profoundly undermining factor in the Latin American lineup at Havana was the lack of solidarity between the various Central and South American countries. They had no common economic and political program. This is largely caused by the unevenness of their economic development. It is true that Chile, Mexico and Cuba came forward with important progressive proposals (for the nationalization of basic resources, relief for Spanish refugees, and self-determination of European colonies in the Americas), and several of the other countries also submitted resolutions, which we shall discuss later, but only the United States had a comprehensive program.

The gravest weakness of the Latin American countries at Havana, however, was that, save for a few instances, they were represented by reactionaries unresponsive to the democratic needs and demands of their respective peoples. Spokesmen for the many semi-fascist dictatorships in Central and South America, euphoniously called democracies (*e.g.*, the Vargas regime in Brazil), these reactionaries played the game, openly or covertly, of American, British or German imperialism at the expense of their own peoples.

The only clear voice of the Latin American peoples in connection with the Havana Conference came from their Communist Parties and other Left-Wing groups. "The purpose of the Havana meeting," correctly said Secretary Encina of the Communist Party of Mexico, "is to establish the economic as well as the political control of Yankee imperialism over the twenty Latin American nations" (*Sunday Worker,* July 28). Blas Roca, Secretary of the Communist Party of Cuba, declared (*Daily Worker,* July 17) that the Conference was "called by the imperialists to fasten the chains of slavery upon the Latin American peoples." The Left-wing daily, *Hoy,* of Havana, said (July 29): "We must state that the resolutions adopted at the Havana Conference by no means interpret the will of our peoples." Earl Browder, Secretary of the Communist Party of the United States, warned of the imperialist designs behind the Conference. The Communist Parties of this hemisphere, in connection with the Conference, also proposed programs, based upon the democracy and unity of the Latin American peoples, which we shall later discuss.

II.

The Main Decisions of the Conference

Of the 56 proposals submitted to the Conference there were adopted 21 resolutions, one recommendation, one convention, and four declarations. Only one of these, the so-called Act of Havana, relating to the seizure of colonial possessions of non-American powers, requires ratification by three-fourths of the constituent states. In this article we can analyze only the more important of the propositions dealt with by the Conference.

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

(a) *The Question of European-held Colonies*

The most crucial question at the Conference was that relating to taking over colonial possessions held by European powers in the Americas. Prior to Havana, as we have seen, there had been developing a strong agitation in the United States to get Great Britain and France to cede their Caribbean Island colonies, either in payment of defaulted war debts or as the basis for new war credits. This imperialist proposition was endorsed with sugary "anti-imperialist" demagogy by Norman Thomas (*The United States News*, July 24). But the collapse of Denmark, Holland, France and the threatening defeat of Great Britain by Germany, suddenly made this whole question much more urgent. There arose the possibility that many valuable and strategic colonies would pass under the control of a victorious Nazi Germany. These colonies included Bermuda, the Bahamas, the Windward and Leeward Islands, Barbados, Jamaica, Guiana, Honduras, Trinidad (British); and the colonies of the "beheaded" governments, already dominated by Germany—Martinique, Guadaloupe, Guiana (French), Curacao, Surinam (Dutch), and Greenland (Danish). All these colonies are highly strategic. Although not much was said about Canada in Havana, American imperialists are notoriously prepared to take that country under their "protection," should the British Empire be destroyed in the war. Roosevelt's proposed naval and air bases in Canada and Newfoundland, and also the plan for American warships to patrol the Canadian coasts, are all aimed at reducing Canada to the sway of the United States.

To forestall the danger to American imperialism of Hitler seizing territory in this Hemisphere, the Roosevelt Government took action at Havana. Mr. Hull suavely proposed, as though the idea had been suggested by other governments, that the Conference go on record against the "transfer of American soil from one European power to another" and that in the event such was attempted one or more of the states of the Western Hemisphere should seize the territory in question and set up over it "a collective trusteeship, to be exercised in the name of all the American republics."

Considering the strength of American imperialism and the weakness of its opposition, this innocent-sounding proposal, of course properly camouflaged with altruistic phraseology about the defense of the Americas from war and barbarism, constituted a bold attempt of the United States to seize the valuable colonies of the various European powers. Not deceived by Hull's honeyed words, German imperialism raged at the project, and British imperialism, although seemingly about to grant the United States strategic naval bases, sent the Duke of Windsor to the Bahamas to dramatize its intention of hanging on to its American colonies. Its controlled Argentina delegation took up the fight at Havana against Hull's proposal. But this opposition was fruitless. Save for the substitution

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

of the word "administration" in place of "trusteeship," the American proposal carried.

Under the resultant "Act of Havana" the "Inter-American Commission of Territorial Adjustment" will be set up, consisting of one representative of each of the states which ratify this convention. Meanwhile, a small committee dominated by the United States has been established. In case of emergency this committee is to seize, temporarily it is assumed, possessions and colonies menaced with transfer from one non-American power to another and to set up an administration over them. Especially important is the provision that permits any one of the republics, in case of necessity, to take over colonies in question, pending the meeting of the full committee. Also a very important departure from former Pan-American procedure was the abolition of the unanimity rule. This makes it easier for American imperialism, by manipulating the most subservient and reactionary governments of Latin America, to seize various colonies.

In view of the tremendous strength of the United States, the present weak position of British and German imperialism, and the unorganized and undemocratic condition of most of the Latin American republics, the occupation of colonies under this arrangement would be tantamount to an American conquest. The colonies would be denied the right of self-determination. Their seizure would be carried out by United States armed forces principally, and their "administration" would be dominated by Yankee imperialism. What this would mean to the peoples involved is made clear by the intolerable conditions prevailing in Puerto Rico after forty years of American rule.

That the American bourgeoisie thoroughly understands that the Act of Havana would facilitate American aggression in Latin America is shown by the high degree of unanimity in Congress and the press behind Hull's proposal. There is backing for it also in middle-class circles, the Gallup Poll recently announcing an 87 per cent vote in favor of the United States seizing if necessary all foreign-held possessions in the Panama Canal area. The *New York Post* (July 31) characteristically says that the Act of Havana "gives the United States full authority to take over any French, Dutch, Belgian or Danish possession at any time." *The New Republic* (August 5) declares, "Thus the United States could, if need arose, take over the French or Dutch colonies, under the sanction of the Pan-American doctrines, simultaneously asking the Committee to approve the action. Failure to approve would be unlikely." The *New York Journal-American* (July 31) cynically inquires:

> "Why all the elaborate nonsense about establishing a protectorate of all American Republics over these islands? What nation is going to maintain the protectorate. . . . The United States alone—*none other*."

(b) *The Question of Commodity Surpluses*

On the matter of the European-held colonies American imperialism

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

won a victory in the Havana Conference. Regarding its attempted economic domination of Latin America, however, its success in the Conference was more circumscribed.

On the eve of the Conference President Roosevelt announced, with a big fanfare of publicity, a scheme for organizing a great Pan-American economic cartel, the purpose of which was to buy up and market the entire surplus commodities of all North, Central and South America, including Canada. Tentatively called the Inter-American Trading Corporation, this continental cartel was to have been capitalized at two billion dollars, and it would have required a yearly subsidy of half a billion dollars from the United States. The true purpose of this gigantic project was to drive not only the "enemy" imperialisms of Germany, Italy and Japan, but also of "friendly" England, out of the Latin American markets. *Pravda* correctly said that "the plan actually provides for complete monopolization of Latin American trade by the United States." (July 28.)

But this grandiose imperialistic scheme had to be laid aside for a more subtle approach. A big section of Wall Street did not want any such sharp warfare against Hitler. The Latin American peoples displayed wide opposition to the cartel for their own democratic reasons. Brazil, Argentina and neighboring countries came out openly against it. Consequently Hull had to withhold the cartel scheme from the Conference and to present a program more modest and innocent-looking, but aiming towards the same monopolistic objectives. He stated it as follows:

"1. Strengthening and expanding of the activities of the Inter-American Financial and Economic Advisory Committee as an instrument for continuing consultation with respect to trade matters, including especially the situation immediately confronting the American Republics as a result of the curtailment and changed character of important foreign markets.

"2. Creation of facilities for the temporary handling and orderly marketing of accumulated surpluses of those commodities which are of primary importance to the maintenance of the economic life of the American Republics, whenever such action becomes necessary.

"3. Development of commodity agreements with a view to assuring equitable terms of trade for both producers and consumers of the commodities concerned.

"4. Consideration of methods for improving the standards of living of the peoples of the Americas, including public health measures, nutrition studies, and suitable organizations for the relief distribution of some part of any surplus commodities."

The foregoing statement of Hull's proposals can serve also as a report of the action taken on the question, so closely did the Conference follow the United States line. The economically stricken Latin American countries had no counter-program of their own, nor were German or British imperialism in a position to block Hull's project. It was not so much a case of specific economic decisions by the Conference, as of a course of procedure. It now remains

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

for the United States to work out its economic treaties with the specific Latin American countries. These arrangements will go far beyond the eleven reciprocal trade agreements now in effect. To implement its new economic program in Latin America with funds to make loans to finance surpluses, the Roosevelt Administration proposes that $500,000,000 be allocated by the United States Congress.

Behind Hull's sugared economic plans, adopted by the Conference, lurk many dangers of subjugation for the Latin American peoples. In its cartel scheme the Roosevelt Administration exposed its hand, showing unmistakably that it was seeking to monopolize the trade and to regiment the economic life of the Latin American countries. Under the plan adopted at Havana it can and will work towards these same general ends. It can scarcely be termed an accident that Nelson Rockefeller [owner of great Venezuelan oil interests.—*W.Z.F.*], the man who broached the cartel idea to the President, should have been given the post of coordinator of relations with Latin America.

The crux of Latin America's economic problem is to increase its reduced production or to dispose of its surpluses of commodities, now piling up faster than ever because of lost European markets due to the war. This year Brazil is burning nine million bags of coffee, half its total crop. Many of the Latin American commodities, especially those of the countries south of the "bulge," are either directly competitive with American commodities, or they are commodities with which American markets are already saturated, such as meat, wheat, corn, hides, wool, cotton, sugar, coffee, nitrates, copper, oil and silver.

"Even geared to a war economy," says *PM* (July 31), "the U.S.A. could not consume more than 50 per cent of normal South American exports."

Ordinarily, 70 per cent of the exports of Chile, Argentina and Uruguay go to Europe and only 15 per cent to the United States. Hence, notwithstanding all of Hull's rosy promises, the United States, when dealing with this problem, whether by a general cartel or by individual agreements, will face the alternative of either carrying through a limitation of Latin American production or a wholesale destruction of surplus commodities. It will inevitably choose the former, because it will not want either to hand a half-billion-dollar yearly subsidy to rival imperialist concerns and Latin American interests, or to curtail American production. Production in Latin America would be worked out in favor of the big American companies both in those countries and in the United States.

In consequence, we may expect that the United States will use the most drastic financial and political pressure upon the Latin Americans to force them to cut production of their competitive export goods. A strong weapon to this end will be its power to grant or refuse loans. American Big Business will also seek to direct the import buying of the Latin American countries into United States markets. The whole

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

tendency will be to infringe upon the economic and political independence of the Central and South American nations, to degrade their economy down to a colonial status, into a mere feeder to American industry and profit-making.

Because Europe is the natural market for many Latin American products which the United States cannot absorb (meat, oil, coffee, cotton, etc.) American imperialism will be compelled to resort to various forms of force in its trade wars against Germany and England in Latin America. The Havana Conference resolutions forecast this line of policy. Latin Americans would do well to heed this warning in the "liberal" *New Republic*, which is a thinly disguised statement of the design for Wall Street hegemony over Latin America:

"The attitude of the United States is that we intend to carry through our plans of keeping the fascist dictators out of the New World, with Latin American support if possible, but without it if necessary." (July 29.)

Secretary Hull's assurances that all the economic control measures American imperialism is now striving to put through on Latin America are temporary, and that trade will return to a free basis after the war, have no more validity in fact than has his demagogy about disposing of the troublesome economic surpluses by systematically raising the living standards of all the American peoples. The true prospect is that even after the war ends chaotic conditions will prevail in the world markets while capitalism lasts, and barter systems and cartels will be the order of the day on an unprecedented scale. Therefore, should American imperialism in its quest for world domination succeed in getting the iron-clad grip upon Latin American economy that it is now working for, it would never again willingly relinquish it, peace or no peace. The aim of Yankee imperialism is definitely to subjugate Latin America economically, and with this, politically.

(c) *The Question of Subversive Activities*

Another important resolution adopted by the Havana Conference contained a series of proposals ostensibly designed to defeat "fifth column" activities throughout the Americas. This matter was heavily stressed by Hull in his opening speech. It is basic in the plan of American imperialism to control Latin America. The insidious proposition adopted was dressed up in the usual elaborate pretenses of democracy and national self-defense.

The resolution provides for joint consultation, and presumably joint action, by the Western Hemisphere governments "to prevent and suppress any activities directed, assisted or abetted by foreign governments or foreign groups, or individuals which tend to subvert their domestic institutions or to foment disorder in their internal political life or to modify by pressure, propaganda, threats, or in any other manner the free and sovereign right of their

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

peoples to be governed by their existing democratic systems." To make this proposed cooperation effective, the resolution provides for an exchange of police information regarding "subversive activity" in the various countries, and also for the tightening up of passport restrictions.

These provisions constitute a serious menace to the democracy and national independence of the Latin American peoples. American imperialism long ago learned that its program of exploitation in Latin America can succeed only by suppressing the popular movements of the masses. We may be positive, therefore, that the American Government's fight against "subversive activities" will be directed not only against agents of its imperialist German, Italian, Spanish and Japanese rivals, but above all, against the Communist Parties, the trade unions, the Popular Front movements, the peace activities, and all other organized expressions of democracy in Latin America. The imperialism of the present United States Government makes it automatically the enemy of everything progressive in Latin America. It was no mere coincidence, therefore, that in Mexico Americans, unrestricted by Roosevelt, supported the bandit Cedillo against Cardenas. And now by virtue of American support of the fascist Almazan against Camacho, Mexico has been brought to the brink of a dangerous, reactionary rebellion. The American imperialist idea of fighting the "fifth column" is well typified by Martin Dies' reactionary activities, both in the United States and in Latin America.

Under the Havana resolution to suppress "subversive activities," the near-fascist dictator of Brazil, Vargas (or any one of a dozen others like him at the head of Latin American governments), should he feel that, in the language of the resolution, the "democratic institutions" of his country were threatened by a Popular Front movement (which he would surely brand as the work of foreign agents) he could call in to his aid the United States. When we recall Roosevelt's shameful record in crushing Spanish democracy, and the innumerable American interventions in Latin America on behalf of reactionaries, how can we doubt that any such reactionary in trouble with his people would find forthcoming aid from the United States Government? The Latin American peoples will do well to beware of the resolution in question. Unless they do this it may easily become a dangerous source of American-financed counter-revolutions and a deadly weapon generally in the hands of native tyrants and Yankee imperialists against Latin American democracy and prosperity. The danger is all the greater because in Latin America the reactionary elements, demagogically seizing upon the issues of the war and the economic crisis, are everywhere raising their heads.

(d) *Other Decisions of the Conference*

The foregoing questions regarding colonies, economic surpluses and

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

"subversive activities" constitute the main business of the Havana Conference. But there were also various other matters disposed of. One of the most important was the proposal by the Chilean delegation, leading to the nationalization of European-held properties. Its key proposition reads:

"Chile recommends to the Consultative, Economic and Finance Committee a study of the ways and means to facilitate matters for the American Republics in acquiring the rights that foreign continental enterprises enjoy in several countries in this hemisphere, especially in public utilities."

This proposal, indicating the path which is essential to secure the independence of the Latin American countries, shocked the imperialist Americans. With five billion dollars of American investments in Latin America, about the last thing they wanted to see was a nationalization movement, even of this limited scope, getting under way in Latin America. So Chile's proposal was rejected.

Mexico, supported by Argentina and Uruguay, also made a progressive and therefore an unwelcome proposition. This was that arrangements be worked out to receive Spanish Loyalist refugees on a hemisphere scale. Hull wanted none of that. The plan was knocked on the head by referring it to a committee for further study.

Cuba, through Batista, made the democratic proposal that in the event European-held colonies in the Western Hemisphere were taken over by the American Republics, their peoples be accorded the right of self-determination and started on the road to independence. This proposition, too, was pushed aside.

Among other matters disposed of by the Conference were the adoption of proposals reaffirming the use of peaceful methods for settling inter-American disputes and the establishment of a committee therefor; for the removal by the various republics of all internal barriers to continental solidarity; a declaration for joint defense by the American Republics in case of aggression by a non-American power; a resolution of sympathy with the Chilean Government in its break of diplomatic relations with Spain; for the completion of the Pan-American highway.

The Havana Conference wound up amid a general salvo of applause from American imperialism and its hangers-on in the United States. Politicians of both capitalist parties, great daily papers of Republican and Democratic persuasion, and reactionary radio commentators, all joined in a paean of applause for the "splendid work done for peace and democracy" by the American delegation in Havana. With few exceptions, liberals, conservative trade union leaders and Social-Democrats also joined in this nauseating praise. *The New Republic* (August 5) said, "The Secretary of State and his collaborators have done a magnificent job." "Well done, Cordell Hull," cried the *New Leader* (August 3); and Matthew Woll had the gall to assure Mr. Hull that organized labor was solidly behind him.

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

III.

The Latin American National Liberation Movement

Obviously the Latin American peoples are in a difficult position in the face of the determined drive of American imperialism to dominate them militarily, to control their economic and political life, to use them as pawns to "appease" the fascist dictators, and to kill off their young manhood as cannon fodder in the imperialist war. And their troubles will hardly diminish with the end of the present war, especially if Germany should win. For then they will face the prospect of their countries being made the scene of a bitter economic and ultimately also military struggle between clashing imperialist powers. It is clear, therefore, that the Latin American peoples have an acute need to take steps in their self-defense. Their fight takes the form of a national liberation movement against world imperialism. For them to rely upon the United States or upon any other imperialist power would be a fatal error.

The Communist Parties throughout our hemisphere have outlined the general program necessary for the Latin American peoples to defend their well being. Its starting point is the struggle for democracy in the respective countries on the basis of the development of the agrarian and anti-imperialist revolution. The Latin American peoples cannot protect themselves from their imperialist exploiters and oppressors so long as their governments (with the exception of Chile, Mexico and Cuba) are in the hands of reactionaries of various stripes. Many of them, corrupt to the core, endorsed the Franco rebellion and are notorious imperialist tools. The people's front movement of workers, farmers, professionals and other democratic strata has made great progress in many countries of Latin America, although its tempo of development has slowed up somewhat since the outbreak of the war. Its spread and victory throughout all Latin American republics are the fundamental condition for the maintenance of their national independence and the development of their democracy and prosperity. To cultivate this movement is the basic task of the Communist Parties of Latin America.

Another urgent necessity for the Latin American peoples is to develop a unity of program and action among their various countries. Affiliation to the Pan-American Union on the basis of a supposed equality with the United States cannot provide such unity. The exact forms of the necessary Latin American solidarity cannot now be forecast. Acting individually, their states cannot possibly defend themselves against the economic, political and military attacks of the great imperialist powers who, now more than ever, are determined to subjugate them. The Latin American peoples have the most basic interests in common and they can unite. A democratic and united Latin America would be powerful enough to defend itself against all the assaults of the imperialists—*European, Asiatic* or *American.* A strengthened Latin

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

American Confederation of Labor and a linking up of the various national people's front movements would serve as the backbone of a solidarity among the Latin American republics.

With their fight for democracy and unity as a basis, the Latin American peoples need to accomplish several very elementary urgent tasks in order to guarantee their national independence and to open up the way for the expanding well being of their populations. First of all they have to secure control of the natural resources and industries of their respective countries. These, to a very large extent, are now in the hands of foreign imperialists. For example, 50 per cent of the total land in Costa Rica is owned by the United Fruit Company. Very much needed throughout Latin America, therefore, is a great, united movement for the nationalization of the oil wells, railroads, mines, packing plants, plantations, etc., now owned by American, British, German, Italian and other imperialists. This becomes a burning issue regarding the industries of those European countries already overrun by Germany. A healthy industrial and political life cannot exist in Latin America so long as the economic foundations of the countries are owned and exploited in the interest of these capitalists. Also vital is it to cultivate trade among the Latin American republics without, as now, Americans acting as intermediaries. Regional conferences to this effect would be practical.

Only by effective struggle to secure control of their national resources and industries will the Latin American peoples be enabled to reorganize their industry and agriculture upon a basis conforming to their interests. At present their whole economic life is on a semi-colonial basis, organized for the most part to satisfy the export needs and profits of the imperialists. There must be a more balanced and comprehensive industrialization, necessary resources for which exist abundantly in Latin America. The great haciendas and plantations should be broken up, the land put in the hands of the users, and a mechanized, diversified agriculture developed. In each country there should be developed the broadest and most intense struggle for these reforms, which must also be the objectives of broad movements among all or most of these states.

In this period of the decaying capitalist system, in which the great empires are waging ruthless war upon each other and against weaker peoples, there is the most urgent need also for the Latin American peoples to develop a program of joint armed defense of their various countries. This can be done effectively only upon the basis of the broadest Latin American solidarity and democracy. The individual countries are not strong enough to defend themselves, and for them to rely upon the United States or upon any of the other imperialist powers for protection would mean to become a satellite of these states. The Latin American republics, cooperating as a bloc for defense, would be strong enough to protect themselves from the imperialist powers,

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

whether in trade wars or military struggle. Moreover, working in collaboration with the Soviet Union, nationalist China, the oppressed peoples of the earth, the world labor movement, and the downtrodden masses generally, the Latin American peoples would be a great force for world peace and progress.

The foregoing proposals—for Latin American democracy and solidarity, for the acquisition of the natural resources, for the reconstruction of industry and agriculture, and for a common defense program—are both practical and imperative. Their realization would provide the basis for national independence for the Latin American peoples and for a measure of protection for them against the wars and other ravages of a dying capitalist world order. But in order to escape wholly from the poverty, misery, oppression and war inherent in the capitalist system, and to open up a path to real prosperity, freedom and peace for themselves, the peoples of Latin America, like those of all other countries, will have to abolish capitalism and establish socialism. Thus, Latin America will one day constitute a great and flourishing section of the world socialist system.

The workers and other democratic forces in the United States and Canada should give the heartiest support to the peoples of Latin America in their fight for democracy and national independence. The interests of all the peoples of the Hemisphere—for prosperity, freedom and peace—are as one against the predatory exploiters and warmakers of the Americas and of the world. As Comrade Browder has said: "Latin America needs the help of the United States, even as we need the cooperation of Latin America." (*Daily Worker*, July 16.) The vital necessity of unity cannot be stressed too much in the successful working out of the great problems—economic, political and social—of the peoples of the Western Hemisphere. Blas Roca, Secretary of the Communist Party of Cuba, correctly stated:

"The unity of the people in each nation and the unity of the progressive and anti-imperialist forces throughout the continent, is the best answer to the attempts of the Nazis in the Western Hemisphere, is the best weapon in the hands of the people against the furious assaults of Yankee imperialism." (*Daily Worker*, July 17.)

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

LABOR AND THE ELECTIONS

BY GENE DENNIS

ONE of the peculiarities of the present political situation is that while the working class is developing increased mass opposition to the imperialist policies and war program of the Government and Wall Street, the main sections of organized labor are giving qualified electoral support to the major parties of capitalism, especially to the Democratic Party, even though *millions of workers will do so reluctantly and against their wishes.* This is likewise true regarding the electoral policy of most of the other organized sectors of the working people, though here support is more evenly divided between the Republicans and Democrats.

As is well known, many of the leaders and organizations of the C.I.O. and Labor's Non-Partisan League, despite the position of Lewis, have endorsed or are working for the re-election of President Roosevelt. The Tobin-Green-Harrison wing of the A. F. of L., the Social-Democratic Federation and the International Ladies Garment Workers Union, as well as most Railroad Brotherhoods have taken a similar position. As for the Woll-Hutcheson group in the A. F. of L., their alignment with the Republican Party remains as firm as ever.

Why is it that large sections of the working class which are developing greater independent political activity in behalf of labor's rights, social legislation, civil liberties and peace move so slowly and hesitantly to break completely with the two-party system of capitalism?

Why is it that the favorable possibilities for organizing a third party, a mass anti-war party, in time for the 1940 presidential elections were not realized? What can be done *now* to advance the movement for such a party, for a militant, united front mass party of labor and the common people?

Why is it that the bulk of the membership of the C.I.O. which is firmly united around John L. Lewis as the national leader of labor, which vigorously opposes America's participation in the imperialist war, which actively supports the militant union and legislative program of the C.I.O., at the same time is influenced, in varying degrees, by the reactionary election policy of the Hillmans, Murrays and Van Bittners who are trying to make the

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

C.I.O. an appendage to the Democratic Party and a component part of the "national unity" program of Big Business?

Why is it that big sections of the A. F. of L. which are resisting the attacks against organized labor under the anti-trust law support the Roosevelt Administration which has turned the Sherman Anti-Trust Act into its antithesis, into a weapon of oppression against the entire labor movement? And why is it that a part of the A. F. of L. and millions of unorganized workers are similarly deceived into supporting the Republican counterpart of monopoly capital's two-party setup?

How is it that important sectors of the working class which today are practically united against military conscription and are beginning actively to oppose the establishment of a war regime, are nonetheless giving a measure of electoral support to the Democratic and Republican parties—the parties of the economic royalists, of imperialism and war, of M-Day plans and a war economy, the parties which are supporting and establishing, step by step, the most reactionary regime of finance capital?

Clearly, many factors are responsible for this situation. The traditions and obstacles of the American two-party system, and above all, the historical "lag" in the organization of the American working class as an independent political factor, organized in its own class party, undoubtedly continue to play a certain role in determining the election policy and activities of labor in the present situation.

However, the immediate causes for the existing political position of labor, the main reasons why organized labor as a whole is not pursuing a clearcut and firm independent political line in the elections are largely a result of the following:

1. The temporary effects of Wall Street's policy of "national unity" which has sown certain confusion in labor's ranks, thereby hindering the movement for independent political action;

2. The reactionary influence of the disastrous Social-Democratic theory of the "lesser evil" which, together with the treacherous policies of the "Socialists" and social-reformists, has served to some extent to divert temporarily a section of organized labor away from the path of developing labor's independent political role and activities to the new and higher stage which present conditions make possible;

3. The mistakes and weaknesses which the progressives in the labor movement have committed and displayed in their efforts to promote the formation of a new political alignment and a people's front party of labor and its allies.

Let us briefly examine these three factors which are closely related and are largely a result of the reactionary policies and influences of Social-Democratism.

First, take the question of "national unity," the reactionary banner around which the economic royalists and the social-reformists of all shades are striving to harness organized labor and the working people to the war-chariot of American imperialism.

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

The working class, in unison with the majority of the American people, realizes that the peace and liberties of the American people are endangered today more than ever before in the history of our country. They are alarmed at the prolongation and spread of the imperialist war and the dangers this holds for the American people. They are seriously disturbed at Hitler's military victories, the betrayal and fall of France, and the menace of an imperialist peace of violence and oppression.

The American bourgeoisie, the imperialist war-makers in Wall Street and Washington, are trying to capitalize on this popular sentiment and the desires of the masses to safeguard the peace, welfare and national interests of the people. As in France, Britain, and Germany, Wall Street and its "Socialist" lackeys are striving to utilize the issues of national defense as a means of dimming the class consciousness of the working class, stirring up chauvinistic nationalism among the toiling people, and for misrepresenting the monopoly interests of the economic royalists as the interests of the entire nation.

The Morgans, du Ponts, Rockefellers and their political spokesmen are endeavoring to instill in the minds of labor and the people the idea that only a Democratic or a Republican government—a government of the monopolists, imperialists and war-makers—can ensure "national defense." And with the aid of the "Socialists" and reformist trade union leaders, they are trying to palm off their predatory policies of imperialist expansion, conquest and aggrandizement in Latin America, the Far East and Europe, as well as their reactionary domestic program of war profiteering, unbridled political reaction and exploitation, and the establishment of a military regime, as "national defense," "national safety," and the "defense of American democracy."

As events have shown, the joint "national unity" drive of the warmongering social reformists and the bourgeoisie has not been crowned with too much success. The anti-war position of Lewis and the majority of the C.I.O. unions, and the anti-imperialist stand of the American Youth Congress, the National Negro Congress, and the nationwide Emergency Peace Mobilization at Chicago, etc., bear eloquent testimony to this.

However, it is a fact that the proponents of a "united nation" behind the Government's vast program of armaments and military preparations for imperialist adventures and war have created not a little confusion within the labor and progressive movement, have influenced a section of the working class, as well as a large stratum of the middle classes.

Whereas the anti-Soviet incitements and the imperialist slogans to "save little Finland" did not catch hold of the masses, and while the imperialist battlecry to "aid the democracies by all methods short of war" has failed so far in breaking through the popular wall of mass opposition to America's participation in the war, the call for "national unity for national defense" has had a greater and more harmful effect

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

upon the labor and peace movement.

For it must be recognized that while there is growing mass resistance and widespread distrust and misgivings regarding the foreign and domestic policies of the government, of Democratic and Republican "statesmen" alike, among many sections of the working people there is a strong belief that "adequate national defense" requires a "common national effort." There is also a feeling, or hope, among large masses that "preparedness safeguards peace," that somehow or other the "total defense" program of the Administration may be used for "defending" America from invasion, and not for waging an imperialist war.

This explains, in part, the discrepancy between the mass opposition which has developed against the interventionist moves and unneutral acts of the government and Congress in foreign affairs, and, above all, to the military conscription bill, and the limited opposition registered against the colossal armaments program and the dictatorial "national emergency" powers granted to and exercised by the President.

This partially explains why many of the members of the National Council of the C.I.O., at their recent meeting, while reaffirming their will to keep America out of war and their determination to defend labor's gains and rights, permitted themselves to be maneuvered by the Hillmans, Murrays and Van Bittners into giving formal support to the "national defense" program of the government, of our "own" imperialists.

Note must also be taken of the "national unity" moves engineered around and through the Labor Advisory Policy Committee. Neither the membership of the A. F. of L., the C.I.O., nor the Railroad Brotherhoods have shown the slightest enthusiasm for this "labor" adjunct of the National Defense Commission. And many workers and a number of unions are beginning to question the advisability of demanding labor representation on, or participation in, the Government's war boards.

They are commencing to understand the class nature of "national unity" as symbolized by the National Defense Commission which is headed by Knudsen of General Motors and Stettinius of the U. S. Steel Corporation, and includes the inimitable class collaborationist Sidney Hillman who has been appointed to try and compel labor to accept and submit to the "national defense" policies of Big Business. Ever larger sections of labor are starting to learn that "cooperation" between labor and the representatives of the House of Morgan in the governmental agencies is similar to company unionism, only much worse. It is streamlined class collaboration for executing M-Day plans and militarizing the country, for conscripting and regimenting the working people, for leading the country into new imperialist exploits and war.

Nonetheless, while the workers are apprehensive about the role of the Defense Commission and its "labor" appendages, labor as a whole does not yet fully grasp the dis-

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

ruptive, strikebreaking, red-baiting and class-collaborationist policies which such agencies of imperialism as the Labor Advisory Policy Committee pursue and will develop.

This is why Labor Defense Commissioner Hillman and his committee already have been able to influence temporarily, but adversely, a number of trade unions with the corroding and reactionary ideology of "work, sacrifice and national unity," for the "defense" program. This was evidenced in the signing of the General Motors agreement in the auto industry and the "settlement" of the wage demands of the aluminum workers. This is seen in the development of the so-called youth apprenticeship and training system for "service" in the national defense industries which, despite its anti-labor features, is being organized with the approval and unqualified support of many labor leaders. This is witnessed in the moves being initiated by Hillman and the committee for promoting "labor unity," modeled after the infamous plans of Woll, Green and the National Association of Manufacturers.

In so far as the elections are concerned, the paralyzing and dangerous influence of the campaign for "national unity for national defense" has played no small role in helping disorientate the electoral policy of important sections of organized labor.

In the name of "unity," of "patriotism," "national security," and "labor's welfare," the Hillmans and Van Bittners, the Tobins and the Watts have been able to mislead as well as to intimidate many leaders and organizations of both the C.I.O. and the A. F. of L. into endorsing Roosevelt for re-election. This is the case, not only in the International Ladies Garment Workers Union and the Amalgamated Clothing Workers, but even in such unions as the Steel Workers Organizing Committee and especially the United Automobile Workers where the sentiment for organizing a third party is strong, where the workers have greeted and actively support the independent political activities and orientation of the progressive forces in the C.I.O.

And just as the Hillmans and Olivers have sabotaged every move of the progressives to direct the political activities of Labor's Non-Partisan League and the C.I.O. into channels leading to the formation of a national Farmer-Labor Party and Presidential ticket, both prior to and during the 1940 election campaign, so, too, they have brought all their influence to bear to divert existing third-party movements away from the path of independent political action and struggle against the imperialist war. This is exemplified in their wrecking activities in the American Labor Party in New York and their efforts today, taken in conjunction with the La Follettes and the Hjalmar Petersens, to bring the Progressive Party of Wisconsin and the Farmer-Labor Party of Minnesota into closer alliance with the Democratic Party and its imperialist policies.

It is precisely because of the deep concern of the American people for protecting and extending their democratic rights, for defending the

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

true national interests of the nation, which the Roosevelts and Willkies debase and would destroy, that the Hillmans, Greens, Dubinskys and Thomases strive so vigorously to identify the imperialist program and military preparations of the Government and the Democratic and Republican parties with genuine national defense.

It is precisely because the American working class stands ready to defend the national interests of the people at all costs, to defend their rights, to champion their needs and aspirations, to fight for peace and freedom, that the social-reformists and "Socialists" advocate and pursue a policy of class collaboration, a policy of "national unity" in the interests of finance capital, a policy of subordinating the class interests of labor to the class interests of the monopolists, of the imperialists.

It is precisely because the working people are determined to defend the nation that the so-called New Dealers, the Social-Democrats and the social-reformists in the trade unions bend every effort to identify national defense with the defense of the class rule of the bourgeoisie, with the defense of predatory American imperialism, and with organizing labor support for the two-party system of capitalism.

It is true that the imperialist bourgeoisie, their political representatives in Washington and their "Socialist" and "labor" lieutenants, have not succeeded in confusing and disrupting the labor and peace movement with the poison of war hysteria and national chauvinism to the extent which they had anticipated or toward which they are striving. But as the developments in the election campaign show, it would be a most serious mistake to underestimate the influence and effects of the campaign for "national unity for national defense."

This is why it is necessary at all costs more energetically *to expose the class nature of "national unity"* and the Administration's "defense" program, and more effectively to combat these imperialist policies. *To accomplish this, it is essential at all times, during and after the election campaign, to develop a more skillful and consistent struggle against the influence and ideology of Social-Democratism, against the treacherous role and policies of the "Socialists" and social-reformists.*

* * *

The next factor which should be noted in connection with the electoral position of labor in the current presidential campaign is the dangerous influence of the bourgeois-reformist and Social-Democratic ideology of the "lesser evil."

In the absence of a third party of the working people, important sections of the labor movement, such as in the automobile, rubber and steel unions, which are increasingly coming into conflict with Roosevelt's policies, which are abandoning many of their bourgeois-democratic illusions regarding both the Democratic and the Republican parties, and which, despite numerous zigzags and vacillations, are playing a more active and independent political role in the maturing anti-imperialist people's front movement for peace,

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

civil liberties and social security—are being lulled and deceived into supporting Roosevelt in the November elections on the basis that Roosevelt and the so-called New Dealers represent a lesser evil for labor than Willkie and the Republicans.

The argument that the Roosevelt Democrats represent the lesser evil in the elections is undoubtedly the single most effective ideological weapon which the "Left" social-reformists, as well as the Hillmans, Murrays, Greens and Dubinskys are utilizing in the present election campaign to muster labor backing for a third term for Roosevelt and to prevent a mass breakaway movement from the two-party system of capitalism.

Let us briefly examine from the viewpoint of the elections the main argumentation of the proponents of the theory of the lesser evil, the infamous theory of Social-Democratism which helped pave the way for fascism in Germany and France and which already has seriously retarded the political development of the American working class to a position of complete political independence as a class.

It is alleged that labor and the common people should vote for Roosevelt because Willkie is a direct representative of Wall Street. Unquestionably Willkie is a "utility magnate," personally connected with the House of Morgan, and cannot be supported by labor. The nomination of Willkie shows, among other things, that certain Wall Street circles consider it essential in the present turbulent political situation to bring forward their own candidate. They find it advisable and feel confident enough to put across, not only a servant of monopoly capitalism, but one of its direct representatives. They consider that in the present situation their monopoly interests might be more safely promoted through Willkie than Roosevelt, that perhaps the sham concessions which Roosevelt is still forced to make to labor may create unnecessary difficulties in the further unfolding of the policies of the imperialist bourgeoisie.

But how does all this make Roosevelt a lesser evil? True, Roosevelt is often characterized as a bourgeois-democrat, none the less he is a representative of his class, of the bourgeoisie. As events have shown—such as in the days of the acute economic crisis of 1929-33, and again today in the midst of the imperialist war and in a period of the sharpest crisis of world and American capitalism—*the "liberal" bourgeoisie, of which Roosevelt is typical, follows a reactionary policy in the interests of the bourgeoisie as a class, that is, in the interests of its dominant circles, the imperialist bourgeoisie.*

The nomination of Roosevelt by the Democratic Party convention, made unanimous after the first ballot, is in itself indicative of whom Franklin Delano Roosevelt represents and serves. Roosevelt's nomination for a third term was possible only because of the fact that, despite certain differences on secondary questions within and between the two major parties of capitalism, *finance capital is united on all major questions of foreign policy and "na-*

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

tional defense" which Roosevelt supports and advances. It also shows that influential Wall Street groups, including some of the most aggressive imperialist circles, are inclined to support Roosevelt for re-election, and certainly would not be opposed to a third term for a Roosevelt Administration.

Furthermore, on the question of "direct representatives of Wall Street," is it not a fact that Roosevelt has brought into the Government, in the interest of "national unity," in behalf of the common interests of the bourgeoisie as a whole, two Republicans, Knox and Stimson, both of whom are directly connected with and represent the most bellicose, interventionist and reactionary circles of Wall Street? Is it not a fact that Roosevelt has established a "strong, select and reliable" inner war cabinet of "national defense" under the leadership of Knudsen, Stettinius and Rockefeller—direct representatives of the most powerful and predatory Wall Street circles?

Concerning the tactical differences, real and apparent, which exist between Roosevelt and Willkie regarding certain domestic questions and their attitude towards labor, it must be recognized that these are differences over *methods,* not over principles. For the Democratic and Republican parties are the twin parties of the economic royalists and have common class interests and imperialist objectives, as is exemplified by the similarity of their election platforms and the unity of their actions in Congress on all basic questions of foreign policy and "national defense." As events have demonstrated, the present differences within and between the two parties and their presidential candidates arise chiefly from the traditional operation of the two-party system of capitalism, from parliamentary conflicts over partisan, group and sectional interests, and from what tactics to pursue in exploiting labor and the working people, in promoting their common imperialist interests.

Therefore, for instance, while both the Democratic and the Republican parties, platforms and candidates indulge in considerable demagogy, especially to exploit the peace sentiments of the people and to win the farmers, the Roosevelt Democrats go to greater lengths in their efforts to secure the electoral backing of organized labor.

Because of his "New Deal" past and because of his dependence on the electoral support of organized labor, Roosevelt finds it necessary in the election campaign to give more lip service to progressive labor and social legislation than do the Republicans.

But more than this, while pursuing a consistent and more openly reactionary course, the Roosevelt Administration still employs certain of the methods of the "liberal" bourgeoisie and, in advancing the imperialist policies of finance capital, combines some of the methods of bourgeois reformism with the increased use of methods of coercion and repression. Whereas Willkie and the Republicans, who are concentrating in the elections upon securing mass electoral support primarily

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

from the city middle classes, the farmers, and the Negro people, are less reticent than the Democrats in revealing their common class objectives regarding labor, and speak out more openly and boldly in favor of destroying labor's rights and existing social and labor legislation.

The reformist trade union leaders, the "Socialists," and the "New Deal liberals" also assert that labor should support Roosevelt as the lesser evil because, as some of them say: "Yes, Roosevelt may follow an imperialistic policy in foreign affairs and has sponsored and introduced a number of reactionary domestic measures, yet he is opposed to fascism. Whereas a Republican administration would not only pursue essentially the same foreign policy, it would at the same time bring fascism to America."

Obviously, the internal as well as the foreign policy of a Republican government of the Willkies, Hoovers and Fords would be based upon the most reactionary interests of the imperialist bourgeoisie. As a counterpart of a predatory war policy, violent political reaction and capitalist exploitation would be intensified to the maximum, limited chiefly, as now, *only* by the militant resistance of labor and its allies, by the degree to which working class unity and a people's anti-imperialist front of struggle develops.

Valid as this is, what is there about Roosevelt's domestic policies, not to speak of the Administration's militant imperialist policies abroad, of the Government's efforts to prolong and spread the European war and to involve America in it, of its active policy of imperialist expansion and conquests in Latin America and the Pacific, of its hostile attitude towards the Soviet Union, etc.—that labor should prefer Roosevelt's reelection? Does the fact that some of the most reactionary circles of finance capital are sharply attacking the Roosevelt Administration, primarily on matters of internal policy, signify that the Roosevelt Democrats are champions of bourgeois democracy and are opposed to the establishment of the open terrorist dictatorship of American monopoly capital? Does the fact that there are shades of differences between Roosevelt and Willkie, between the so-called New Deal Democrats and the Hoover Republicans over methods of applying certain policies, especially regarding labor and social legislation, does this make Roosevelt preferable to Willkie and a lesser evil?

Life itself has answered these questions in the negative. The Roosevelt Government, despite the progressive features of certain aspects of its former bourgeois-democratic legislative program in the period roughly between 1935 to 1938 when it depended upon and was influenced by the rise of the progressive labor movement around the C.I.O., was and *is a capitalist government*. For a time, during certain phases of the so-called New Deal period, it followed a policy in the interests of the less reactionary elements of the bourgeoisie, which at times coincided to a limited degree with certain immediate interests of the masses.

But with the outbreak of the war

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

between the Anglo-French and the German imperialists, when, as analyzed by Georgi Dimitroff, the division in the ranks of the bourgeoisie into less and more reactionary groups lost its former significance, when the group and sectional interests of the bourgeoisie receded into the background, giving way to the *common imperialist interests of the bourgeoisie as a class*—the Roosevelt Administration unfolded and has pursued a more reactionary, war-mongering policy, a more active imperialist policy in both foreign and domestic affairs.

The subsequent close collaboration between the Roosevelt and the Garner Democrats, and between the dominant Republican and Democratic Congressional groups, is common knowledge. On all major issues such as for "aiding the Allies," making the United States a non-belligerent combatant as a prelude to dragging the country into war, extending the domination of American imperialism in Latin America, launching a huge armaments and military program, introducing the M-Day plans, subsidizing the war profiteers and the big monopolists, hamstringing expenditures for social welfare, introducing universal military conscription and "alien" registration, and drastically curtailing civil liberties and many trade union rights—the reactionary role of the Administration, of Democrats and Republicans alike, is also a matter of public record.

What has not been sufficiently grasped is the fact that the governmental measures already taken, or in the process of execution, for placing the country on a war basis, for establishing a war economy, for militarizing the nation, for augmenting the dictatorial and "emergency" powers of the President and the executive branches of the Government, and for virtually abrogating the Bill of Rights, constitute *more* than a quantitative operation and extension of imperialist acts and policies.

A qualitative change is also taking place. A more open and reactionary form of the dictatorship of finance capital is in the process of being established. A dictatorial military regime is being inaugurated step by step. The system of state monopoly capitalism is being extended and the vast economic and political powers of the giant monopolies are being strengthened.

This, among other reasons, is why Roosevelt is not a lesser evil than Willkie, is not a barrier to, or a guarantee against, the establishment of fascism. This is why, as the National Committee of the Communist Party of the United States re-emphasized in its recent statement on the national conventions of the Democratic and Republican parties (see p. 771 of this issue), labor and the people cannot support, directly or indirectly, either major party or their presidential candidate.

For it is clear the immediate question facing the American workers and toilers, under the conditions of the imperialist war and the profound sharpening of the general crisis of capitalism, is not a question of bourgeois democracy versus fascism. It is not a question of "choice"

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

between the bourgeois-democratic or the open, violent form of the dictatorship of the bourgeoisie.

The issue today is one of organizing a determined struggle against the bourgeoisie as a class, against the imperialist policies and war program which the government and Wall Street are pursuing. The immediate issue is one of combatting the establishment of the reactionary regime which is being established by the ruling circles of finance capital with and through the Roosevelt Administration, in collaboration with both the Democratic and Republican parties.

The issue now is, as Georgi Dimitroff has forcefully emphasized, that:

"Whereas formerly it was a question of barring the road to the onslaught of capital and fascist reaction, now the working class is faced with the task of conducting a most resolute struggle against the regime being established of unbridled terror, oppression and plunder of the popular masses. . . ." (Georgi Dimitroff, *The War and the Working Class*, p. 15.)

Some of the exponents of the lesser evil theory, including certain "labor leaders," contend that the existing "national emergency" inevitably makes it necessary to establish some sort of a dictatorship, with unlimited wartime powers vested in the President. So, according to these gentlemen, better that Roosevelt should hold the reins of governmental power than Willkie, because Roosevelt still employs some of the methods of bourgeois-reformism, incorporates some trade union officials in the state apparatus, and after the present war crisis is over Roosevelt would, they say, return to "democratic," "New Deal" methods of government.

What these "friends of labor" neglect to point out or fail to realize is that regardless of the immediate outcome of the Anglo-German war, American imperialism is now bringing up its military strength to correspond with its economic and political position as the world's most powerful imperialist power, and as such is determined to expand and strengthen its imperialist positions and domination on a world scale, especially in Latin America and the Far East, as well as within the country. As a result of the growing imperialist appetite and aggressive ambitions of Wall Street, and because of the violent sharpening of the crisis and contradictions of capitalism, the bourgeoisie and its Roosevelts *will be unable, as well as opposed to,* returning to the "New Deal" era and the old bourgeois-democratic methods of government.

Unless the working people, under labor's leadership, succeed in forging a mighty anti-imperialist people's front of struggle and in establishing a government without monopolists, imperialists and warmakers, a farmer-labor government which would champion a people's program for national defense, curb the monopolies, pursue a firm peace policy, collaborate with the U.S.S.R. to help end the imperialist war and bring peace to the peoples, protect civil liberties, promote social welfare, and advance the struggle for socialism—then, irrespective of the

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

outcome of the war and the imperialist adventures and exploits of American monopoly capital, the American people will be confronted with new wars and the most extreme political reaction, intensified capitalist exploitation and oppression.

Another angle of the lesser evil theory as put forward by many agents of imperialism within the labor movement is that labor should support the President because the Republican Party is the party of "appeasement." The pro-Roosevelt "Socialists" and social-reformists and liberals are striving to exploit the fear of the people that the termination of the Anglo-German war might result in the establishment of another imperialist peace of annexations, terror and national oppression modeled after the fate of France. They are doing this in order to try and weaken the opposition of the masses to Roosevelt's war policy and to bolster Roosevelt's electoral strength in the labor and peace movement.

And the President himself considers this line of attack as legitimate partisan politics useful for dual purposes of electioneering and war incitement, especially since certain Republican circles are endeavoring to picture the Republican Party as a "peace party" and the Democratic Party as the war party —an illusion which the Wolls, Hutchesons and Townsends are attempting to propagate to Republican advantage, with Willkie in this instance presented as a lesser evil to Roosevelt. This explains the prominence which Roosevelt gave in his presidential acceptance speech to attacking his Republican opponents as "appeaser-fifth columnists."

Certainly it is no secret that within the ranks of the Republican Party there is to be found an influential group of the American prototypes of Chamberlain. The Hoovers, Vandenbergs and Lindberghs champion and frequently give public expression to those tendencies among the bourgeoisie which are popularly identified as Munichism, "appeasement."

But it is equally true that the dominant groups in the Republican Party have adopted and follow a foreign policy and "national defense" program similar to that of the Roosevelt Administration and in alliance with it, an imperialist policy representing and fully in accord with the interests and objectives of the main sections of the American imperialist bourgeoisie.

Since the dominant sections of American finance capital are united upon a policy of imperialist aggrandizement, conquests and the strengthening of world hegemony of American imperialism, the dominant circles of the major parties of monopoly capital—the Democratic and Republican parties—jointly carry out an imperialist policy of "national unity" for spreading and prolonging the imperialist war, for preparing America's entry into the war as a belligerent, for speeding up war preparations and the militarization of the country, for embarking upon new imperialist undertakings in Latin America and the Far East, etc.

The unfolding of this aggressive imperialist policy, which among other things is sharpening most acutely the contradictions and struggles between American imperialism

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

and its imperialist rivals, particularly Japanese, German and British imperialism, does not however preclude the establishment of temporary "agreements" with one or another of its imperialist competitors, not even with the Mikado or Hitler, on terms advantageous to American finance capital. Nor does it exclude the possibility that in the future, unlike at present, American imperialism for its own immediate interests may endeavor at times to improve its relations with the Soviet Union, notwithstanding its firm and unchangeable hostility and enmity towards the Land of Socialism.

When and if the main sections of American monopoly capital consider it politically expedient to carry out a so-called policy of "appeasement" or a so-called policy of "rapprochement" with the U.S.S.R., its government and both of its parties will, as in the past, execute such tactical maneuvers. And as for Roosevelt and "appeasement," he has already amply demonstrated that the present Administration is just as flexible as any Republican Administration could be. Suffice it to point to the collaboration between the Roosevelt Administration and the Chamberlains and Daladiers in the criminal Pact of Munich, to the Administration's "non-intervention" policy in Spain, to its betrayal of China and its efforts to provoke war between Japan and the U.S.S.R.

The conclusions to be drawn from this are that *both* the "tendencies" and tactics of "appeasement" and "war and aggressive intervention" are imperialist and do not stand in contradiction to each other; both "tendencies," in the sense of differences among and within the bourgeoisie over questions of tactics, are present in both the Democratic and Republican parties; both major capitalist parties and their Presidential candidates represent and serve the interests of the dominant sections of American finance capital; both parties and candidates are carrying forward an active policy of imperialist expansion, aggression, war preparations and military involvement—a policy which does not remove the possibility of tactical shifts, such as reaching temporary "agreements" with imperialist rivals, engineering new Munichs at the expense of other imperialist powers, and of the Soviet Union, China, Latin America, as well as the American people.

This is another reason why neither Roosevelt nor Willkie are "lesser evils," why the labor movement and the people should not and must not support either the Democratic or the Republican parties.

This is why the "Socialists" and social-reformist trade union leaders who are trying to influence organized labor to pursue an election policy based on the tactic of the lesser evil are once again betraying the interests of the working class. They are trying to prevent labor from marching forward as an independent political force, uniting and leading the working people around an anti-imperialist, anti-monopoly program of struggle for peace, security and freedom, for defending the national interests of the people. They are endeavoring to check and disorganize the anti-war movement and the struggle for independent labor political action. They are trying to keep labor and

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

the people in bondage to the "national unity" program and parties of imperialism, reaction and war.

* * *

If the proponents of the lesser evil tactic are able in the present elections to affect, to some extent, the electoral policy of many workers and progressives, including sections of the labor movement which are in favor of independent political action, then the reasons for this are by no means limited to the weight of their arguments.

Nor is this situation to be explained solely by the influence of Social-Democratism and the treacherous policies of the Hillmans, Dubinskys and Greens—damaging as these have been and are. And least of all is it to be ascribed to the alleged political "backwardness" of the working class, a phenomenon which has definitely lost its former significance during the recent period in view of the heightened class consciousness, militancy and growing political maturity of the progressive labor movement.

As we noted earlier, one of the peculiarities of the present political situation is the fact that large sections of the labor movement, which are more and more resisting the imperialist policies of the Administration and the major capitalist parties, are yet reluctantly giving a measure of electoral support to the Democratic and Republican parties in the current elections. Undoubtedly this is to be explained to a considerable extent by the absence of a practical election alternative in the form of a militant third party and ticket.

The influence of the ideology of the lesser evil has been enhanced in the election campaign precisely because of the dilemma which millions of workers and toilers are confronted with—their willingness and desire to take an independent political position in the November elections in opposition to the major capitalist parties, yet, with a few local exceptions, having no opportunity to do so in terms of having an independent national political party and ticket to support and vote for other than the Communist Party. And while the majority of the working class is not yet convinced of the need of voting for and directly following the leadership of the revolutionary vanguard of their class, the Communist Party, *today millions of workers and toilers are convinced of the need of a national farmer-labor party, and would support an anti-monopoly, anti-war, people's front party and program of struggle.*

For today, unlike the situation in the 1936 elections or even in the 1938 Congressional elections, the progressive labor movement, organized around the C.I.O., is more politically conscious as a class. It is stronger politically and organizationally, notwithstanding the split in the trade union movement.

Except for a section of its top leaders, it has not entered into an alliance or election coalition with the Government and the Democratic Party. It has lost many of its illusions regarding Roosevelt and has practically no illusions concerning the Democratic Party as a party, let alone in regards to the Republican Party. Moreover, today more than at

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

any other time, the progressive labor movement is coming into sharper conflict with the economic royalists, their Government and parties on the economic field, on the legislative front and in the struggle for peace and civil liberties.

That conditions are and have been ripe for some time (at least since the period during and following the 1938 elections) for forming an organized political coalition and party of labor, the progressive youth, the Negro people and the working farmers, is concretely evidenced by a number of significant political developments. Among these are: the broad mass support, not only within the C.I.O., but also among the membership of the A. F. of L. and Railroads Brotherhoods for the independent legislative program and activities of the C.I.O. and for the anti-war position of John L. Lewis; the joint legislative pacts and political cooperation between Labor's Non-Partisan League and the C.I.O. and the American Youth Congress and the National Negro Congress, as well as the friendly relations now established between the C.I.O. and the Townsend pension movement; the advanced political position taken by the National Maritime Union and the Maritime Federation of the Pacific; the militant anti-war and independent political activities of the Washington Commonwealth Federation, the progressive wing of the American Labor Party, and the Left wing within the Farmer-Labor Party of Minnesota; the policies adopted by the National Conference of the American Youth Congress in July, and the Emergency Peace Mobilization in Chicago; the nationwide anti-war movement which crystallized in opposition to the Burke-Wadsworth military conscription bill.

In fact, the Chicago Emergency Peace Mobilization, which rallied and united large sections of the labor and peace movement, established a national anti-war center and leadership, and which crystallized a highly important anti-imperialist front organization and mass movement with tremendous potentialities, demonstrated most vividly, despite its limitations, the existing possibilities for organizing a national farmer-labor party. Also it has made the formation of such a party easier of solution, particularly if the entire progressive labor movement becomes the *main base* and provides the necessary *political leadership* for the further development of the anti-war movement.

In view of all this, it must be admitted that if the many favorable conditions for organizing a national farmer-labor party and ticket in time for the 1940 elections have not yet materialized, no little responsibility for this situation rests upon many of the leaders of the progressive labor movement. It is true that the reactionary policies and disruptive role of the "Socialists" and the social-reformists like Hillman, Green, Tobin, Dubinsky, Waldman, Thomas, Oliver, etc., have served to hinder and weaken the movement for independent political action and have created innumerable difficulties for the progressive wing of organized labor. But it is also true that the mistakes and vacillating policy

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

of many of the progressive labor leaders have contributed to the present uneven and unsatisfactory state of affairs regarding the independent political organization of labor and the people, particularly regarding the status of the farmer-labor party movement.

Many of the progressive leaders of the C.I.O. have hesitated to move firmly and more boldly towards building an independent political party because of "practical" considerations. Since the 1938 elections they have vacillated between a policy of greater independent political activity and organization of labor, and an opportunist tactic of trying to reach a qualified electoral agreement with the Democratic Party on the basis of obtaining certain concessions for labor from the Roosevelt Democrats on questions of labor legislation, the election platform and the presidential ticket.

Early in January, 1940, after it became crystal clear that even these limited conditions would not be met, most of the Lewis forces felt that it was too late for labor and its allies to act independently in launching a third party or ticket in time for the November elections. They overestimated Roosevelt's influence among the masses and were doubtful regarding the electoral strength of a new party, a labor and people's party.

Most of the progressive labor leaders did not fully appreciate the militancy and political maturity of the progressive labor movement or the potential *rallying power* of an independent party and program of struggle among the workers, the other anti-war forces and the masses generally. Nor did they adequately grasp the fact that labor and the people have everything to gain and nothing to lose by crystallizing their forces in an organized political coalition and party, regardless of its vote in November—though even here the possibilities existed for polling a larger presidential vote than La Follette's in 1924 and of electing an influential bloc of labor and anti-war Congressmen.

Such a party, if organized not on social-reformist lines, but *as a militant people's front of struggle under labor's leadership,* could protect and advance the interests of labor and the working people on all fronts in their day-to-day struggles against the monopolies and the war-makers.

The organization of an independent and militant farmer-labor party could mobilize and unify labor and the people in effective mass actions for safeguarding the rights and standards of labor, for protecting the welfare of the youth, the Negro people, the aged, and the farmers, for defending and extending the civil liberties of the people, for curbing the monopolies and war profiteers, for enforcing a national defense program in the interests of the people, for promoting a positive peace policy, for checking the militarization of the country and the establishment of a more reactionary regime. It could pave the way for the establishment of a government which would guarantee the peace, life, liberties and welfare of the American people. And from the narrowest viewpoint of "practical" considerations, its independent vote

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

and mass strength would command more "respect" from the government and Congress, would wring more "concessions" and reforms for the working people from the present and the next Administration than any electoral agreement between labor and either the Democratic or the Republican party could or would produce.

Another costly mistake and serious shortcoming in the position of most of the progressive labor leaders was, and to some degree still is, the inconsistency and slowness with which the Lewis forces in the C.I.O. began to expose and combat the class collaboration and red-baiting policies of the Hillmans, Van Bittners, Fagans and Olivers. And it was and is precisely these elements which have sabotaged and hampered the C.I.O. and Labor's Non-Partisan League from within and have retarded the political advances and development of the progressive labor movement at every stage, particularly since 1938.

Closely bound up with this is the vacillating and opportunist position which many of the progressive labor leaders have taken on questions relating to the civil rights of the Communists and the peace policy of the Soviet Union. Some of these leaders, of course, are unclear regarding the socialist program, aims and work of the Communists, as well as do not yet understand the historic role and the international significance of the uncompromising struggle for world peace and freedom which the Land of Socialism is steadfastly waging in its own interest and in behalf of the working people of all countries. Confusion and mistakes on their part are therefore understandable, though none the less dangerous to the interests of the American working class.

But some of the progressive labor leaders know better. They know from first-hand experience the constructive role of the Communist Party and its devotion to the interests of the working class. Yet they frequently temporize and retreat on the issue of defending the civil liberties of the Communists. Evidently they have not learned the lessons of Spain and France. They do not yet fully appreciate, or are unwilling to recognize, that to conciliate, condone or participate in attacks on the Communists, to tolerate the abrogation of the civil rights of the Communists, mean to weaken and help destroy the entire labor movement and the cause of peace and freedom. Otherwise they would not be silent or virtually acquiesce in the present onslaughts against the Communists. *They now would, for instance, actively defend the electoral rights of the Communist Party of the United States, which means to defend the democratic rights of free elections and the civil liberties of their own unions and the working class as a whole, means to defend the right to organize for peace and freedom.*

Some of the progressive labor leaders likewise know better than to try and lump the U.S.S.R. together with the "totalitarian"' dictatorships. They know the difference between the Soviet Union *where the working class is in power* and Hitler Germany, fascist Italy and militar-

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

ist Japan, as well as "democratic" Britain and America, *where the monopoly capitalists are in power.* They know that the Soviet Union champions the cause of socialism, peace and national freedom everywhere and at all times, while the fascist powers, like our "own" Wall Street monopolists, are the "champions" of imperialism and imperialist war, of capitalist reaction and exploitation, of national enslavement and destruction. Yet many of the progressives yield to the reactionaries on this point for the sake of "political expediency."

By so doing they are compromising their own positions, they are capitulating to the warmongers, to the common enemies of the American working class and the Soviet Union—the economic royalists and their "Socialist" lackeys. By so doing they are not jeopardizing the U.S.S.R., which does not require their "protection," but *they are, however, jeopardizing the national interests of the American people which require peaceable relations and collaboration with the Soviet Union and its peace policy as an elementary matter of national security.*

Similarly, the stand of the majority of the progressive labor leaders on the issue of national defense has weakened the movement for independent political action and a mass farmer-labor party, just as it has harmed the struggle for labor's economic demands and the union organization drives. The inclination and tendency of many progressives to compromise on this vital question, or to limit the opposition of labor to the Government's imperialist "defense" program to isolated features of the program, only serves to disorientate the labor and the peace movement and to undermine the struggle for labor's rights, for peace and for genuine national defense. Certainly, it is difficult for many workers to understand where the dividing line is between a policy of giving qualified support to the Administration's "defense" program and a tactic of giving electoral support to the Democratic and Republican parties.

The progress of the independent political development and role of labor from now on will depend, to a large extent, *on how quickly the progressive labor movement establishs clarity in its ranks on all questions of foreign policy and national defense, and takes a principled position on these questions based on the interests of labor as a class, and the role of the working class as the true champion of the interests of the nation.*

What is especially necessary here is that the progressive labor movement and the working class shall be convinced and won over to support actively an *anti-imperialist people's program for national defense.* This means a program which includes not only the most active struggle for the present vital immediate demands already brought forward by labor for protecting its wage standards, union rights, social welfare and civil liberties, but *also* embraces the cardinal points of an anti-war, anti-imperialist foreign policy, including the establishment of genuine friendship and close collaboration between the United States and

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

the U.S.S.R., as well as *brings to the forefront the basic prerequisite for true national defense, the establishment of a government without monopolists and war profiteers, without imperialists and warmongers.*

The progressive labor movement will undoubtedly focus serious attention on these and allied questions and will find ways and means of removing the existing shortcomings, mistakes and opportunist tendencies within its ranks. This is essential if the movement for independent political action is to develop rapidly, if the anti-war movement is to be strengthened and made more effective, if the existing possibilities for organizing a new united front party of the people, a militant farmer-labor party, are to be realized in time, regardless of immediate election considerations.

* * *

The time remaining before the November elections is extremely limited. Yet much can still be done during the course of the election campaign to improve the position of labor and its allies, and to spur on and strengthen the movement for independent political action.

Among the most immediate and vital tasks confronting the labor movement, including its Communist vanguard, in connection with what should be done especially in the period from now till the elections, are the following:

First, it is necessary and possible to use the election campaign as a means of bringing forward and waging still more resolutely the struggle for the most pressing needs of the workers, the exploited farmers, the youth, women and the Negro people. *For, the development of unity of action and organized mass activities for the immediate economic and political demands of labor and the people, for peace, jobs, security and civil liberties, constitutes the main foundation for advancing the independent interests of the working people in the elections and for crystallizing the movement for a broad, united people's party.*

Therefore it is doubly urgent during the election period, as well as after, to expand the independent political activities of labor and the toilers in support of the legislative and anti-war program of the progressive labor movement; to strengthen the drive to organize the unorganized, especially in the war industries, and to raise the standards of living of the working people; to fortify and build up the labor unions and the other mass organizations of the people and to defeat the renewed campaign of the fifth columnists—of the economic royalists and their "labor" agents—for splitting and dividing the labor and peace movement by red-baiting and war hysteria; to widen the struggle for safeguarding the civil liberties of the unions, the Communists, the Negro people and the foreign born; and especially to broaden the mass movement crystallized around the Chicago Emergency Peace Mobilization and its program of struggle for peace and liberty, against the imperialist war and for keeping America out, against the militarization of the country, against war profiteer-

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

ing and war preparations, and against the bellicose, imperialist moves of the Government and Congress.

By working in such a manner, now and following the elections, it will be possible more effectively to expose and combat the imperialist policies of the Government and Wall Street, of the major capitalist parties and their "Socialist" and social-reformist lackeys. It will be possible more rapidly to nullify the effects of the treasonable alliance between the Hillmans and Greens, and the Knudsens and Stettiniuses. It will be possible more speedily to advance the movement for independent political action and the crystallization of a broad, united front party of labor and the common people. It will help accomplish this because the further organization of working class unity from below and the strengthening of the developing anti-imperialist people's front mass movement, constitutes the cornerstone and basic prerequisite for establishing a national, militant farmer-labor party *and* for defending the social and national interests of the working class and the toiling people.

Secondly, it is important to develop a much more *concerted campaign and mass movement in the Congressional and assembly districts* around a people's front program, and for electing reliable anti-war, labor, and progressive candidates, including a number of Communists. In certain districts, such as in New York City and Minnesota, this task is facilitated by the fact that in addition to the Communist Party and its candidates there are a number of other tested people's candidates already put forward by existing independent political parties which enjoy considerable mass support. In a number of other districts and states favorable conditions exist in the fact that a series of anti-war and pro-labor candidates, while formally running on either the Democratic or Republican ticket, are actively supported by organized independent political groups such as Labor's Non-Partisan League or the Washington Commonwealth Federation. Here, however, the special problem arises of guarding against and preventing opportunist deals and agreements; of conducting the campaign so that the mobilization of mass support for individual candidates, for tested anti-war and progressive candidates who are running on the tickets of either of the two major parties, *does not lead, directly or indirectly,* to giving support to the Democratic and Republican parties as such and to their other candidates.

However, in many states and districts where there are no local or state independent political parties or organizations in existence, where the electoral influence and organizations of the Communist Party are relatively weak, and where the primaries have resulted in the nomination of candidates representing and supporting the Democratic or Republican parties and their reactionary policies, the problem is more complicated.

In this situation, in addition to *mobilizing the broadest support for the Communist Party, its program*

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

and candidates, in some cases it may also be necessary and possible to put forward certain candidates after the primaries as independents, sponsored and backed by existing mass organizations and various united front committees and coalitions.

In other states and districts, besides developing the independent mass work and election campaign of the Communist Party to the utmost, which must be done everywhere throughout the country—*particularly around the candidacies of Comrades Browder and Ford,* the problem resolves itself, in so far as most of the unions and mass organizations are concerned, into organizing the election campaign, *without* candidates and *without* supporting either the Democratic or the Republican or the Socialist parties, primarily as a *non-parliamentary campaign;* as a campaign of mass struggles for the legislative and political program of the labor and progressive movement. This does not preclude but doubly necessitates serious and *sustained political activity to form independent political instruments of labor and the people,* whether in the form of union "Political Activities Committees," L.N.P.L. organizations, "Commonwealth Federations," or local or state "Farmer-Labor" committees or parties.

Thirdly, it is imperative that within the unions and the mass organizations of the farmers, the youth, the Negroes and the women, within the peace groups and the fraternal and national organizations, the progressive labor forces should stimulate *mass political discussions* and develop a real campaign of political enlightenment and education around the central issues and problems of the elections.

In this connection it is necessary not only to unmask the imperialist policies and role of the Democratic and the Republican parties, to expose concretely the meaning and nature of their demagogy and "national unity for national defense" slogans, but likewise *it is essential to bring into the open and combat the influence and the traitorous policies and parties of Social-Democratism and social-reformism.*

It is also essential to place boldly the questions why there is no third party in the present elections; why labor and the people need a people's front party of struggle not only for today, but above all for the morrow; as well as to show *what must and can be done to build it.* In conjunction with this, it is important to popularize and win the broadest mass support for the idea being advanced by some progressive labor leaders regarding the urgency of convening a national political and legislative conference of labor and the common people immediately following the November elections.

* * *

Towards the attainment of these immediate objectives, as well as for realizing the fundamental aims of the working class, the program, policies and election campaign of the Communist Party are directed and dedicated.

Today, as never before, the Communist Party of the United States comes forward in the present elec-

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

tions and political situation as the vanguard of the working class, as the foremost organizer and leader of labor unity and the anti-imperialist people's front, as the staunchest champion of peace, freedom and socialism.

The steadfast and courageous proletarian policy and election activities of the Communist Party are incurring the unbounded wrath and persecution of the economic royalists, and war-makers, the Government and its "labor" and "Socialist" lackeys.

But our program, mass work, and devotion to the interests of labor and the working people are also arousing and unifying the masses, instilling greater class consciousness and understanding in the ranks of labor and the toilers; are reinforcing the struggle for peace, social security and civil liberties; are opening new perspectives before the working class; are pointing the way out of the crisis of capitalism, out of the social system and the class rule of the bourgeoisie which breeds imperialist war, extreme political reaction, exploitation and oppression.

This is why important sections of the labor and peace movement are turning to, voting for, and supporting their revolutionary vanguard, the Communist Party, the only political party which represents and defends the immediate interests and ultimate aims of the American working class.

This, too, is why the independent mass work and election campaign of the Communist Party of the United States must and will be developed with still greater Bolshevik vigor, determination and effectiveness. This is why the Communist Party and its election campaign are strengthening and will further strengthen the political influence and independent role of the working class in the life and affairs of the nation, thereby advancing the movement for socialism, for peace, security and freedom; thereby safeguarding the true national interests of our country.

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

EXIT MAYOR HOAN

LESSONS OF THE SOCIALIST PARTY DEFEAT IN MILWAUKEE

BY N. SPARKS AND F. B. BLAIR

"SOCIAL-DEMOCRATISM, which began by revising Marxism and ended by completely repudiating it, which for decades has served as an instrument for demoralizing and disorganizing the working class movement, *has now become a weapon for the suppression of the working class, a weapon of reaction, imperialist war, and counter-revolutionary attack on the Land of Socialism.*" (Georgi Dimitroff, "Stalin and the World Proletariat," *The Communist International*, 1940, No. 1, p. 22.).

Once again, the Socialist Party comes before the American people asking for their votes under the pretense that it represents a program for immediate improvement of conditions as well as a perspective of ultimate freedom from the horrors of capitalism. Brazenly stepping over the fact that every one of its analyses and predictions about the current of national and world affairs has been proved wrong, and ignoring the record of its own acts which have belied its pretended immediate and ultimate aims, the Socialist Party contemptuously counts on short memories on the part of the people and upon its own shameless skill in sowing ideological confusion and in disrupting the organizational advances of the masses.

But inevitably this service to capitalism results in a catastrophic decline of the Socialist Party itself. The working class elements within the organization increasingly become convinced of the true character of Social-Democratism and move in the direction of the one Marxist party which carries on a consistent struggle for the immediate needs of the people and for socialism—the Communist Party.

* * *

The city of Milwaukee, for twenty-four years under the administration of Mayor Hoan, has long been referred to by Socialists as an example of the value of Socialists in office and of the "practical political sense" of the Socialist Party that was able to gain and maintain political control of an American city with a population of close to six hundred thousand. The defeat of Mayor Hoan in the municipal election last spring has taken away from

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

the Socialist Party their chief and last political stronghold. One might think, if he did not know these Socialist leaders, that this would occasion some serious discussion and analysis in their ranks, but the tone of such political comment was set by Norman Thomas, who, on hearing of the election results, said with characteristic contempt of "the mob," "I guess they got tired of hearing Hoan called 'The Just.'"

The city of Milwaukee and the State of Wisconsin were among the chief strongholds of Socialist organization and influence ever since the origin of the Socialist movement in America.

The great German immigration following the 1848 Revolution brought whole German settlements to Wisconsin, and developed there a large German-American community, containing within itself many of the currents of old-country political life, especially the aspirations of the bourgeois-democratic revolution. This community continued to maintain contact with Germany and was influenced by developments there.

The 48'ers came in a period when the main political issue in the United States was that of slavery. Headed by the bourgeois-democratic revolutionary Carl Schurz, they swung into the Republican Party as the vehicle for the abolition of slavery, helping to secure a victory for the Republicans in the state, as early as 1856.

In Wisconsin, during the period following the Civil War the development of industry was accentuated, accompanied by the growth of a numerous proletariat. Passage of the Exceptional Laws in Germany brought a new wave of immigration —an immigration more working class in character than the 48'ers and with some experience in the Socialist movement. Owing to the fact that the German community among which they chiefly operated was such a large section of the Wisconsin population, the Wisconsin German Socialists were able to escape the effects of the sectarianism of other German Socialist groups for which Marx and Engels frequently castigated the German-American Socialists.

In their beginnings in Wisconsin politics, these early Socialist pioneers acted in coalition with agrarian and other groups, rather than as an independent party. The first Socialist candidate for Governor, Colin Campbell, had support from the Grange in 1875. By 1876 the Socialists had a daily German newspaper in Milwaukee, and in 1877 they published an English weekly, *The Emancipator*.

In 1886, following the great May Day demonstrations for the eight-hour day in which over 15,000 workers (half the voting population) went on strike, the Milwaukee Socialists succeeded in connecting themselves solidly with the labor movement. Due to the desertion of the fight by the Knights of Labor leadership, the Central Labor Union, headed by Socialists, won influence among the thousands of unskilled and semi-skilled Polish and Bohemian workers in the Knights of Labor, besides the support of the membership of its affiliates, largely

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

skilled German workers. The 1886 May Day battles introduced Socialist ideas to the masses of Milwaukee, and brought forward Socialist-minded workers as recognized leaders of various sections of the working people.

The outstanding Socialist leader of those days in Milwaukee was Paul Grottkau, who led the political struggle for hegemony of Socialist politics over the working class movement in Milwaukee, against Knights of Labor leaders like Schilling, who wished to tie the labor vote to the tail of petty-bourgeois politics, as represented by the Greenback and Populist parties. The May Day events of 1886 gave the victory in this struggle to the Socialists. In addition to this fight against the Knights of Labor leaders, Grottkau simultaneously fought the Anarchist followers of Johann Most, who frequently appeared in Milwaukee.

Internal fights within the Socialist Labor Party, then the chief political vehicle of Socialism, delayed for many years the organizational crystallization of the mass influence gained in 1886. In the 'nineties, an "Independent Socialist" movement was started in Milwaukee, with Victor Berger as the main leader, under the name of the Milwaukee *Social Demokratische Verein.* When Debs initiated the movement for a national Socialist Party, the Milwaukee "Independents" actively cooperated and the Social-Democratic Party was founded. Almost immediately, with Debs appearing in person in the Milwaukee election campaign, the Social-Democratic Party snowed under the Socialist Labor Party, getting 2,500 votes to 423 for the Socialist Labor Party. The Socialist Labor Party sank into sectarian obscurity from which it never emerged.

The ability and driving force of the early builders, who organized the efforts of many capable mass workers, and whose number was later augmented by refugees from tsarism with revolutionary zeal and energy, bore fruit in a great corps of Socialist workers constituting a well-organized political machine, with roots in the trade unions and among the masses of all nationalities. By 1910 the Social-Democratic Party won the city elections,* electing the first Socialist Congressman as well, and the Milwaukee Socialist organization stood out as the strongest local Socialist organization in America.

The struggle against the imperialist war in 1917 brought the Socialist movement in Wisconsin to its highest point. Responding to the St. Louis Resolution, inspired by the examples of Debs, Ruthenberg, Browder and those other Left-wing leaders who strove to carry out the mandate of the membership for a militant struggle against the war; incensed by the government persecutions of the Socialist press and Socialist leaders in Wisconsin and Illinois, the working people and the militant farmers of Wisconsin rallied to the polls in 1918 with a conviction that a vote for the Socialist Party was a vote to end the war, a vote against an imperialist peace,

* It was defeated in 1912, and did not regain office till 1916, when Hoan, who had been City Attorney from 1910 to 1912, was elected Mayor, holding this office without interruption till 1940.

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

a vote in support of the great revolution of the Russian workers, and a vote for socialism. It was upon this basis that Victor Berger in a special election early in 1918 was able to roll up a vote of 110,000 (26 per cent of the total vote) for United States Senator; and in the fall election the Socialist Party was able to elect, besides the mayors of several cities and numerous city and county officials, no less than sixteen State Assemblymen out of 100, four State Senators out of 33, and one Congressman (Berger).

The 1919 split in the Socialist Party over these very issues on which they had received their record vote marked the beginning of an uninterrupted decline, except for the period of 1932 when the Socialist Party, in a situation of mass unemployment and economic crisis, regained a temporary increase in strength.

Hoan's "Municipal Socialism"

What was the ideological basis upon which the Milwaukee Socialists, more specifically Hoan, operated—which became known under the name of "Municipal Socialism"?

Milwaukee "Municipal Socialism" was a hodge-podge of utopianism, pseudo-Socialist ideas brought over from Germany, Bernsteinian revisionism, bourgeois reformism, and anything that any newcomer cared to contribute to the ideological stew-pot. At no time was there any serious attempt at theoretical clarity.

The mass movement of 1886 which drove Socialist ideas deeply into the workers' consciousness in Milwaukee had among its leaders adherents of Lassalle and other non-Marxists, who carried over into the Milwaukee Socialist movement all the theoretical confusion that had been found in Germany when they left. Even recently, Socialist speakers in Milwaukee have quoted Lassalle as a "Marxist authority." In the minds of many Milwaukee Socialists, Lassalle, Bellamy and a host of others ranked equally with Marx and Engels as so many authorities in their Socialist calendar.

The "Municipal Socialism" theory of Dan Hoan and others held before the people of Milwaukee the illusion that by continually electing Socialists to office in the city, gradually over a period of time, the city could take over more and more of the public utilities, and finally, if other cities throughout the country did likewise, socialism would come "peacefully" and "legally" to power, through the simple expedient that Socialist majorities in government would pass laws taking away the power of the capitalists by "buying up" their property. In actual practice this "theory" amounted to giving the capitalists a cheaper and more efficient "business government."

This so-called "theory" was ridiculed even by such rank opportunists as Morris Hillquit, who called Milwaukee Socialism "Sewer Socialism," presumably because the local Socialist leaders looked even on their boasted improvements in the city sewer system as a step toward socialism.

The Communist Party always pointed out that the theory of "Municipal Socialism" was a false

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

theory calculated to deceive the people and discredit real socialism, which exists today only in the Soviet Union. The effect of the theory of "Municipal Socialism" was to relegate the struggle for the workers' immediate needs to the background, as subordinate to the fight for public jobs; to make the Socialist Party almost exclusively an election machine; to postpone the realization of all demands of the people to the distant date when the "dumb workers" would "wake up" and vote Socialist majorities everywhere; to encourage every kind of rank opportunist compromise and trading with other political groups; to retard the advent of socialism in America.

The citizens of Milwaukee have always wanted municipal ownership of the electric light and railway system, as well as of other public utilities. The great street car strikes of 1896 and 1934 have made this a mass demand. But this municipal ownership, which can be a good thing for the people, is far from constituting socialism. The experience of the people of New York with city ownership of the transit system brings this out clearly. New York today has much more municipal ownership than Milwaukee; but people cannot fail to see that in New York the bankers continue to draw exorbitant interests, even though the city now operates the traction system. Needless to say, capitalism is not abolished by municipal ownership; the city becomes the operating agent for the bondholders.

Furthermore, the Socialists of Milwaukee, while always talking about municipal ownership, and although they were several times in a position to bring about some municipal ownership, continued merely to talk about it as something to be done in the future, without doing anything to realize it in the present. As a result, the people of Milwaukee, under Socialist administration for twenty-four years, saw their street-car fares and light rates continually raised, and recently saw the abolition of the unlimited street-car transfer meet with no real resistance on the part of the Socialist city and county officials, including Dan Hoan.

But how did Hoan himself view the question of the tasks and opportunities of the Socialist Party while it controlled the city administration? A glance at his book *City Government* (1936) in which he states he has embodied "our practical philosophy of running Milwaukee's government" may prove instructive.

One notes first of all the complete omission of anything dealing with American city government as *government* instead of merely *municipal business*. Of city government as a historically evolved form, originally an expression of democracy in the form of the democratic town meeting of the early colonists, reinvigorated by the Jeffersonian democracy of the Northwest Ordinance (the earliest charter of government in Wisconsin), developing into a form of monopoly capitalist domination—an instrument in the class struggle between Capital and Labor—of this, there is not a trace in Hoan's book.

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Also to be noted is his repeated estimate of the Socialist Party as merely an auxiliary to a bourgeois-reformist "clean-government" movement, independent of class lines. Thus, we read:

"If a city is to be cleaned up and kept clean, a permanent political party must be formed to supply encouragement and active assistance to . . . the administration." (p. 66.)

"The Cincinnati movement confined itself to clean and efficient government. The Milwaukee experiment sought the same objective but chose to build with a nationally recognized political party." (p. 68.)

This viewpoint was by no means unwelcome to the Socialist Party, since it helped them to evade responsibility for the lack of accomplishments of Hoan's administration on behalf of the working class. Is it any wonder that such a viewpoint could produce no results for the working class? Hoan himself gives the tip-off on how the Socialist Party's stewardship for the bourgeoisie regarded the role of labor in the city government:

"We excluded from the Mayor's Advisory Council both the Association of Commerce that represented primarily the manufacturers' material welfare and the trade union groups that represented the workers' material aims. This left us with those organizations that are primarily organized for civic and service purposes." (p. 113.)

In the opinion of the Socialist Mayor, labor had no role to play in the leadership of the mass of the community, and represented equally with the Chamber of Commerce merely selfish group aims.

Needless to say, the elimination of labor's role did not mean the elimination of the role of the manufacturers. The ruling out of the working class means inevitably—as Milwaukee well showed—the foisting of the manufacturers' will upon the city administration. What of ultimate objectives? Of these we read:

"The Socialist Party . . . has devoted its local energies to the immediate measures and demands necessary to improve the condition of the toilers. Its national energies have been devoted to achieving the transition from capitalism to socialism by the peaceful and intelligent use of the ballot." (p. 71.)

Here is a new attempt to explain the un-socialist Socialist administration! It is all a perfectly natural and proper division of labor! Eternity is divided: The past—to the Utopians, Lassalle and what have you. The present—to the Socialist Party of Milwaukee. The future—to the Socialist Party nationally.

But later on, local government again becomes the instrumentality for growing into socialism (locally):

"There is every indication that more and more of the problems of a complex social order will, in the future, have to be met by local government. As private initiative fails to meet and solve such perplexing problems as distribution of milk, marketing of fuel . . . the people themselves will meet the challenge and through the instrumentality of a local government with vision put service before selfish interest." (p. 331.)

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

And so, the failure of the "Socialist" administration to carry out the anti-capitalist mandate of the people, and its surrender to the capitalist interests, is to be charged to the failure of the people to meet the challenge of capitalism!

Is it any wonder that from such a "Socialist" administration there could arise no aid to the actual class struggle of the working class; but only a callous pro-capitalist "impartiality" smeared over with Socialist "sympathy"; and an obtuse bourgeois hatred towards the Soviet Union where the working class struggle has been crowned with victory?

Hoan and his circle were always in the forefront in attacking the Soviet Union. Together with other spokesmen of the Socialist Party, they held up Scandinavia as the Promised Land where capitalism was gradually and peacefully "growing into socialism." Undoubtedly the Milwaukee Socialist administration felt a kinship with the leaders of Scandinavian and Finnish Social-Democracy who, from time to time, were also allowed to hold the reins of government, crack the whip over the working class, and drive down the "Middle Way," advertising their trip as the road to socialism. But in reality there was no more socialism in Norway, Sweden and Denmark (not to mention Finland's Mannerheim brand of "Socialism") than in the city of Milwaukee. Among the propagandists of the "Middle Way," the dream-picture of a petty-bourgeois utopian Sweden held sway instead of the real Sweden. It was the non-typical secondary characteristics that so endeared it to the petty-bourgeois mind—a country of small population, occupying a minor position with regard to heavy industry and industrial natural resources, and not (during the pre-war period) under the immediate control of any single imperialist power.

But the real Sweden presented the same picture of capitalist exploitation and crisis as any other capitalist country. Here it will suffice to mention that the effects of the world-capitalist economic crisis, in decline of production, growth of unemployment, decline of real wages, etc., were faithfully mirrored in the economic indices of Sweden, as contrasted with the complete immunity and constant advance enjoyed by the socialist U.S.S.R.

A Record of Efficiency in Behalf of the Bourgeoisie

"With the help of Social-Democratism," declared Dimitroff, "the bourgeoisie disarms the working class ideologically, undermines its faith in its own strength, poisons its mind with doubt and skepticism, paralyzes its will, disorganizes its ranks, and sets one section against another, and thus endeavors to keep the working class under its ideological and political sway in order to preserve its own class rule." (*Cited place*, p. 21.)

Thus, both in the development of Milwaukee Socialist theory and outlook, as well as its practice, the real needs and aspirations of the masses were left out of the Socialist program. The limit was reached in the election this spring when, despite the burning issues of the

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

new war crisis, the Hoan platform again merely repeated the promise of "efficiency" and "good government." The real issues that occupied the minds of the masses—jobs, peace, labor's rights and civil liberties—were virtually ignored in the Hoan platform and found expression only in the platform and campaign of the Communist candidate.

The campaign of Hoan also failed to give the people any guarantee that anything would be done to improve their conditions and to satisfy their basic needs. When the unemployed, at the call of the Workers Alliance, rallied at the City Hall on "End Unemployment Day," Hoan told them their demands were impossible, that the city could do nothing about improving their conditions, that they should not come to him, but should go to Washington.

In his whole campaign, Hoan gave no answer to the most burning question of how to keep out of the war except casually to raise the pro-Allied slogan of a "United States of Europe." Nor did he give any guarantee that he would fight to defend the civil liberties of the people of Milwaukee against the reactionary, anti-labor warmongers.

Hoan claimed he was running on his record. But what was his record? Certainly, as mayor of a capitalist city under the capitalist system Hoan proved himself an efficient administrator for capitalism and accordingly did his best to wet-blanket the struggles of the masses. Undoubtedly the bourgeoisie of other cities throughout the country would be glad to accept Mr. Hoan as City Manager. But what was Hoan's record during his administration *on behalf of the working class?—for socialism?*

While the city has been kept free from large-scale graft—a situation which, as the Socialists have boasted, is in the best interests of the capitalist class as a whole—nothing can be pointed out in Hoan's record of the last twenty-four years that signifies any general improvement directly affecting the lives of the masses as compared with any other city under a reform administration. Housing, especially, continues to be a scandal. In housing, Milwaukee is one of the worst cities in the country. Leon M. Gurda, city building inspector, is authority for the statement that in this city of 600,000 there is a shortage of 25,000 dwellings. Old houses have been subdivided and partitioned into innumerable one-room dwellings, and sanitary and fire regulations ignored. Rents are exorbitant, and real estate and rooming-house owners' associations bristle with militant indignation when restrictions, no matter how mild, are suggested. Yet, during a period of years, Milwaukee has done relatively less than even New York in beginning an improvement of the housing situation.

Nor was Milwaukee a socialist island of civil liberties in the capitalist ocean. Especially in view of the developing war hysteria and attacks on civil liberties, the people of Milwaukee could feel little assurance from the record of Hoan and the Socialists that they would act as defenders of the people. On the contrary, looking back to the last war period, the record of 1919 shows

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

the same obedience to the dictates of the capitalists and cowardly abdication before vigilantism, on the part of Milwaukee Socialist government officials that has been characteristic of Social-Democratism everywhere in the United States. At the very same time that the Socialist Party's own leaders, Debs, Berger, Ruthenberg, and others, were facing long terms of imprisonment; at the very time when Berger, their elected representative in Congress, was being denied his seat in complete defiance of the Constitution and the law, the Socialist city and county officials were leaning over backwards in interpreting the law against the working class, and attempting to save themselves by diverting the vigilante rage to other working class organizations—the same tactic as their red-baiting today.

Thus, early in November, 1919, without being challenged by Socialist Mayor Hoan or any other Socialist official, Chief of Police Janssen declared, "No meeting of the I.W.W. will be tolerated in Milwaukee and we will order them stopped as we did this summer when they attempted to gather in the West Side Turn Hall." *

It was no wonder that soon after this, on November 21, to quote from the *Milwaukee Journal* of the following day:

"A score of American Legion men, most of them former army officers, descended Friday upon what is said to be the Italian headquarters of the I.W.W. at 33 Martin St., broke open the locked door, smashed a roll-top desk containing the records of the organization, and made a bonfire in the street destroying all of the records and 'literature' stored there. . . .

"Before the American Legion men started for the radical headquarters they visited Chief of Police Janssen and served notice of their intent. No police were in sight as the radical records were burned."

The next day Mayor Hoan demanded the arrest of the mob leaders saying, like certain liberals of today, that the I.W.W. should be handled by the Department of Justice, not by mobs. Needless to say, the Socialist Sheriff's office was "unable to identify the leaders." A similar record was shown by the Socialist Sheriff's office in the Plankinton Packing strike the same month. In the Palmer raids 57 "reds" were arrested and put in the custody of Socialist Sheriff Buech and under-Sheriff Leo Krzycki. The Sheriff and under-Sheriff refused permission for visitors to see the arrested "Communists."

But one has to read the whole record of the time to see how these Socialist officials served as instruments in calling out the National Guard in the Cudahy Packing strike (in the fall and winter of 1919-20), and in general surrender to the vigilante terror of the period. Nor was the record any different in the days of the height of the unemployment demonstrations from 1930 to 1934. Just as many were jailed in Milwaukee, relatively, in the struggle to better relief, stop evictions, etc., as in New York,

* *Milwaukee Journal*, Nov. 7, 1919.

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Boston or Chicago. Was it to be wondered at that the Milwaukee workers in 1940 felt no great enthusiasm for the "Socialist" politicians as prospective defenders of civil liberties in the coming critical period?

Negative Record on Trade Union Organization

It is of even greater significance in the long run that the Hoan administration did not use its position of power to help in the trade union organization of the working class. Despite Socialist domination of the city administration, as well as Socialist domination of the State Federation of Labor and the Milwaukee Federated Trades Council, Milwaukee showed no greater advance in trade union organization than any average comparable city. In the period from 1933 until the rise of the C.I.O. in 1936, the struggle to organize the unorganized met with the same resistance and police terror as in other cities. Milwaukee workers still remember the great streetcar strike with its victims (1934), the Lindemann-Hoverson strike (1935-36), the Geuder Paeschke and Frey strike (1934-35), and many others. And throughout the period previous to the C.I.O., Wisconsin industrial wage levels were lower than in Michigan or Illinois, and Milwaukee industrial wage levels were lower than in St. Louis, Chicago, Minneapolis or Detroit.

Hoan was fond of picturing himself before the workers as an outpost of socialism who had pushed far ahead into the territory of the capitalist enemy and was in the position of a beleaguered fort, helpless to accomplish the things he was so anxious to do until the people would "wake up" and win similar victories everywhere. But the experience of the Communist mayors of the French municipalities during the period before the Popular Front was broken up by the treachery of Blum gives concrete proof that mayors of municipalities can win great accomplishments for the people when they are not afraid of attacking the interests of monopoly capital. Numerous examples were given by the French Communist mayors of effective pressure upon the national government for improved conditions for the people, of transferring burdens from the backs of the common people to those of the rich, of aiding the organization of the working class, and especially of welding together the unity of all elements of the people in the struggle against the representatives of the "200 families."

What did Hoan and the Socialist Party do, especially on this last point of strengthening the unity of the people? The record shows that not only did the Socialist Party throughout the years of the Hoan Administration dissipate the aspirations of the masses which formed its political capital, but also through its struggle against the unity of the people, completely undermined its own organizational base. The period before the 1936 elections was already marked by a powerful rise in the labor movement in Milwaukee. The Communist Party, stressing the great possibilities for political advance that this opened up, pointed

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

out the necessity of organizing all forces of the people around the labor movement into a Farmer-Labor Party.

In 1935 this perspective was realized, although in an inadequate and somewhat distorted form, in the establishment of the Farmer-Labor Progressive Federation, which had every possibility of developing into a great united political movement to struggle for the basic needs of the people against the monopolies, and of winning victories both in the city and throughout the state. But while advocating farmer-labor-progressive unity for the needs of labor and the people *in words*, the Socialist Party and the Socialist leaders of the A. F. of L., who together dominated the Farmer-Labor Progressive Federation, carried on in practice a policy of class-collaboration and disruption. Rejecting any attempt of branches or county organizations of the Farmer-Labor Progressive Federation to struggle for the points in the platform, the leadership, beginning by excluding Communists, soon expelled other members on charges of "Communism" and lifted branch and county charters in a deliberate effort to reduce the organization to impotence except as an election machine for those candidates satisfactory to the controlling clique. As a result, numerous members of the Progressive Party also quit the Farmer-Labor Progressive Federation in disgust. In 1936, when high hopes were held for the Farmer-Labor Progressive Federation, Hoan, by his barrage of red-baiting, reduced his winning majority to the lowest in a dozen years. Following the 1936 election, the Farmer-Labor Progressive Federation refused to allow the powerful C.I.O. unions of Wisconsin to participate in the Federation except on a basis subordinate to the A. F. of L.

For four years following the 1936 mayoralty election, Hoan was Mayor of Milwaukee—supposedly a mayor who had the interests of labor at heart; yet not one move did he make to bring about any form of political unity or collaboration between the A. F. of L. and the C.I.O. It is a matter of public knowledge that the C.I.O. made repeated proposals for various forms of political collaboration, that more than once Hoan was requested to cooperate in solving this problem. But in every case, while professing agreement with the necessity of solving it, he either declared his helplessness or merely made himself a mouthpiece for the actually disruptive position of the Social-Democratic clique at the head of the A. F. of L. and the Farmer-Labor Progressive Federation.

Under such conditions of disunity, labor was not organized politically to play an independent role, but found itself in a position of tagging along behind a candidate and a campaign not really representing its interests and those of the people. Accordingly, it was impossible for labor to mobilize the masses against the youthful reactionary candidate, Carl Zeidler, whose campaign consisted largely of singing "God Bless America" in a fine baritone voice, of declarations that he was fighting for Americanism, against socialism,

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

as well as of special demagogic appeals to the youth. In typical fashion the Socialist leaders tried to blame the results of the election upon the people, saying, "The people didn't work hard enough."

Since the defeat of Hoan, it may be expected that the Socialist Party will again try to boost itself as a militant opposition. At the same time the Socialists are attempting to play a more active role among the warmongering forces and to take over the leadership in the anti-Communist drive. The recent State Convention of the Socialist Party was marked by an attempt to jump on the warmongering bandwagon, as well as by a mourners' session in which the old-timers bemoaned the wreckage that they saw around them.

"An Old Men's Party"

Thus Frederick Heath, member of the County Board and one of the co-founders with Victor Berger of the Socialist Party, lamented:

"We see the Socialist movement dying before our eyes. . . . The Milwaukee Socialist movement has been the marvel of the United States. People have kept asking: 'How did you do it?' What they will ask in the near future is: 'How did you *undo* it?' . . . Today we are a movement without a press. . . . We lost the recent city election . . . because we got out of touch with the working class and left it leaderless."

So also William F. Quick sadly referred to the Socialists as "an old men's party" and declared something must be done to bring in the young people. Whereupon the Convention adopted a resolution deploring "the ignorance of socialism that prevails among youth."

But despite the decrepitude of the Socialist Party, the resolution of the State Convention calling on the national Socialist Party to review its "traditional pacifist" position—in reality expressing their impatience with Norman Thomas' more subtle pose as an "anti-war party"—and the continued wide influence of Social-Democratism among labor and progressive circles in Wisconsin show that the danger of these misleaders must in no way be underestimated. Thus the Convention of the Farmer-Labor Progressive Federation, held on June 22 and 23 in Appleton, adopted a plank in its platform urging "national defense" and extension of all aid "short of war" to the Allies. In addition, the leadership decided to relieve itself of embarrassment by dropping the words "farmer-labor" from the name of the organization. The argument was given that the former name was too cumbersome and that it gave the impression that only farmers and laborers were wanted for membership. The name was, therefore, changed to the "Progressive Party Federation." However, both the pro-war plank in the platform, as well as the change in the name, signify a further admission on the part of the Federation leadership of the fact that the organization has failed dismally actually to win the support of the farmers and workers for its class-collaboration, anti-labor, anti-unity, pro-war record. According to the newspaper account, "Former Mayor Daniel W.

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Hoan of Milwaukee, the guiding spirit of the Convention, and his former secretary, Otto R. Hauser, led the dominant Milwaukee delegation."*

By warmongering and red-baiting the Socialist leadership is attempting to appeal to the fascist elements as the leader of the anti-Communist forces. The first official utterance of a Socialist leader in Wisconsin after the Hoan defeat was the May Day speech of the State Secretary, Frank Zeidler, brother of the reactionary Carl Zeidler, the present Mayor who defeated Hoan. Posing in the melodramatic position of a brother placing his political loyalty above family ties, Frank Zeidler, the Socialist, was in reality merely singing a barber-shop tenor in accompaniment to his brother's reactionary baritone when he devoted almost his entire speech to "exposure" of the Communists and an announcement that the Socialist Party would henceforth act as a finger man for the Dies Committee by exposing all Communists and "Communist fronts" anywhere and everywhere.

The disruptive work of the Socialists in Wisconsin has been directed not only against the Communists, but against the C.I.O. particularly, and even the labor movement as a whole. Much publicity has been given by the United States Department of Labor to the boasted "labor unity" movement in Kenosha which has been advertised by the capitalist press far and wide. In reality, this movement, which is directed by the Socialist, Paul Porter, editor of *Kenosha Labor*, has the political purpose of bringing the C.I.O. unions again under the domination of the A. F. of L. and ultimately severing their affiliation to the C.I.O. It is characteristic that this movement has been pushed under Leftist "rank-and-file" slogans of opposition to the national leadership of "both labor movements." The actual meaning of these "unity" maneuvers has been shown most vividly by the fact that they were preceded by a special campaign of lectures and public meetings in the unions under various labor auspices by a certain Sherman Rogers, representative of the American Legion, who goes around preaching that Capital and Labor must get together ("idle men and idle dollars") and organizing joint Labor-and-Capital banquets where the unions give dinners to the employers and Chambers of Commerce, usually at the immediate as well as ultimate expense of the unions. Such a program of "labor unity," rooted in class collaboration, although directly aimed at the C.I.O., actually undermines the morale and fighting strength of the A. F. of L. unions as well.

* Since this article was written, the Convention of the Wisconsin Federation of Labor, held August 19 to 23, adopted a resolution, presented by the teamsters and building trades, severing its ties with the Progressive Party Federation and declaring its policy to be that of "supporting its friends on any ticket." This step backward from the policy of independent political action of labor is due chiefly to the obvious fact that the Progressive Party Federation has been reduced to political impotence. Undoubtedly the defeat of Mayor Hoan in Milwaukee also influenced the teamsters and building trades who no longer have to deal with a Socialist administration in Milwaukee. Socialist and Progressive Party Federation leaders also fared badly in elections to the Executive Board, David Sigman being defeated and J. F. Friedrick, leading Milwaukee Socialist and general organizer of the Milwaukee Federated Trades Council, just barely winning election.

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Thus the history of twenty-four years of Socialist rule in Milwaukee shows the same record as Social-Democracy shows everywhere else. Rising to office on the basis of a movement built out of the revolutionary traditions of the early immigrants and the sacrifices of the Milwaukee working class, Social-Democracy poisoned the movement at its source by revisionism and class-collaboration. Today, after a whole generation of rule, it can show nothing on which to retain the support of the people, and collapses before the new war crisis. In this crisis it shamelessly takes its position as an enemy of the people side by side with the Dies Committee and the reactionary fighters against the labor movement.

The Communist Party, which has in the last three years exceeded the numerical strength of the Socialist Party in Milwaukee and Wisconsin, comes before the people in this critical year with an election platform that represents the real needs of the people of the state: peace, jobs, security, aid to the farmers and youth, and preservation of civil liberties. The Communist Party tells the people openly that these demands can be realized only through struggle, since they are directly contrary to the interests and plans of Wall Street for war and increased exploitation of the people.

Pointing out the necessity for organizing the unity of the people in a broad mass peace party—a farmer-labor party—the Communist Party brings forward the best traditions of the Wisconsin anti-monopoly, anti-war movement associated with the elder La Follette, but which his sons are attempting to distort today into support of Wall Street aggression in Latin America—as though imperialist adventures in the Western Hemisphere bore some divine sanction denied to imperialist adventures in Europe.

More and more, as the struggle is pushed forward, the Communists are convinced that the best elements among those influenced by the Socialists, as well as those of the old Progressive tradition, will rally to the broad people's movement for peace and security, and will discover that the Communist Party is the bearer of their best aspirations and the consistent fighter for a future that will belong to the people.

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

THE STRUGGLE FOR EQUAL RIGHTS FOR WOMEN

(On the occasion of the Twentieth Anniversary of the Adoption of the 19th Amendment to the Constitution of the United States of America, in August, 1920)

BY MARGARET COWL

ONE of the principal distinguishing features of capitalism is the necessity to divert attention from the economic and social inequality of the masses, by means of a formal declaration of legal equality. An outstanding manifestation of this inequality is the inferior status of women in all capitalist countries. This inequality of women is manifested particularly in the special type of exploitation in employment and in everyday family life. The burden of this inequality is borne by the women of the working class.

In an article published in *Pravda* of November 6, 1919, Lenin pointed out that only:

". . . in words, bourgeois democracy promises equality and liberty . . . in fact not a single bourgeois republic, not even the most advanced one, *has given* the feminine half of the human race either full legal equality with men or freedom from the guardianship and oppression of men. . . . Bourgeois democracy is democracy of pompous phrases, solemn words, exuberant promises and the high-sounding slogans of *freedom and equality*. But in fact, it screens the subjection and inferiority status of women, the subjection and inferiority of the toilers and exploited."

In the United States, even half a century after the adoption of the Bill of Rights, women were not permitted to speak in those assemblies which made the community's laws. When, in 1848, the first women's equal rights convention met at Seneca Falls, New York, the press denounced it as a conspiracy against public morals, the home and the purity of woman. The *Woman's Declaration of Rights* adopted by the convention made such demands as the right to personal and religious freedom, the right to vote and to be elected to political office, to testify in the courts, equality in marriage and the right to their own

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

children, the right to own property and to claim their own wages; the right to education and equality in trades and professions.

Through years of bitter struggle, women in the United States won a number of these rights. Preposterous is the boast of the Democratic Party that Wilson "gave" women the vote. It took over half a century of organized struggle, involving imprisonment and other personal sacrifices, to win suffrage rights in state after state, which finally led to the crowning achievement, the 19th Amendment to the United States Constitution, enacted into law in August, 1920.

Without the militant fight of the working women for economic demands, the achievement of these rights would not have been possible. It was not until early in the nineteenth century that women in the United States entered the factories in relatively large numbers. At that time there was a scarcity of male labor in the manufacturing centers, owing to the great migration to take up the free land of the West. Poverty on New England farms forced women to seek employment in the textile industry. During this period, history records many courageous strike struggles by working women for shorter working hours and better working conditions. A resolution adopted by the women loom-weavers in Philadelphia in May, 1848, indicates the beginnings of an understanding by working women of those days that their plight had its roots in the economic system. The resolution called for a revision of "the iniquitous system by which those who toil most receive least, and those who toil least receive most, and see labor organized on the basis preached by St. Paul so that if anyone would not work, neither should he eat." These struggles coincide with the beginnings of the organized women's movement for equal rights in the United States.

In 1836 the National Labor Union officially recognized the right of women to work. It favored their admission into trade societies. In 1846 the first national women's trade union, the Daughters of St. Crispien, was organized. In 1868 the National Labor Union advocated equal pay for equal work for women and the right of women to vote. It was in this year that Karl Marx congratulated the American Labor Union for extending equality to working women, at a time, as he remarked, when the French and the English were narrow-minded on this question. Marx's greetings to the American Labor Union were based on a resolution adopted by the Geneva (1866) Congress of the First International, which pointed out that the working class struggle can be successful only when women become part of it and when the economic bondage of women is broken.

The century-old history of the women's movement for equal rights in the United States is a splendid record of militant struggle. The women's movement in our country emerged as part of the struggle for democracy. Like the fight to abolish slavery it was a phase of the democratic struggle,

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

and, in both, organized labor played a leading role.

The newcomers into the modern factories, mills, stores, offices and professions carried on in the tradition of past struggles to improve the economic situation of women. The ground had been broken for them by their sisters of the past who had succeeded in winning for women the right to speak from a public platform and to belong to the same trade unions with men. As a result of these struggles, working women could speak out more boldly. With the emergence of the industrial trade unions under the leadership of the C.I.O., women took their place among the most enthusiastic of the militant trade unionists. There are at present over 800,000 women members of trade unions as compared to approximately 350,000 in 1936.

Economic necessity forced more and more women to leave the home to seek paid work. New industrial processes made room for increased numbers of women wage-earners. It is estimated that the figure of nearly eleven million women recorded in the 1930 United States census as engaged in gainful occupations has since been augmented by over two million more women employed or seeking employment.

Women in the United States are in an inferior economic position as compared to men. According to the 1930 census, the largest category of women—3,180,251 or 30 per cent of the total engaged in gainful occupations—are in domestic and personal service occupations. The second largest category—1,986,830—are engaged in clerical work. Manufacture and mechanical trades come third with 1,886,307, and professionals with 1,526,234; commerce with 962,680, agriculture with 909,939, transportation and communications with 281,204 follow in the order given. From these figures it is clear that the great majority of women wage-earners in the United States work in occupations where wages are lowest and unemployment strikes hardest. In recent years this weaker economic position of women has further deteriorated, as is indicated in a 1937 report to the United States Labor Department by its Women's Bureau. The report states:

"The net result of the various economic changes more recently has been to place increasing numbers of women in the ranks of clerical and other white-collar workers, while the hand trades have declined and entrance into factory employment has been less rapid than formerly. In professional service women have increased in numbers as helpers, and in semi-professional work, but in most of the major professions there has been a slowing up and in some even a decline. Three-fourths of all professional workers still are school teachers and nurses. The growth of life in urban centers has been accompanied by a decline in agricultural occupations and an increase or development of certain types of services."

The occupations in which masses of women work are given an inferior status. This is a basic manifestation of the special economic and social oppression to which women are subjected under capitalism. The struggle for equal rights

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

for women, therefore, places as a foremost demand that women be accorded equal rights in choice of occupations and that wage differentials on account of sex be abolished.

In 1936 and 1937, through their trade union activities and pressure upon legislatures for state minimum wage laws, and also in some places by the application of the Federal Fair Labor Standards Act, large numbers of women won improved wages-and-hours standards. Twenty-five states have minimum wage laws for women; but not everywhere are these enforced. The trade unions have not yet fully realized their responsibility to carry on an effective struggle to force the setting up of the necessary administrative machinery to carry these laws into effect. Such a struggle is an integral part of the fight of the working class as a whole for the enactment and enforcement of labor and social legislation.

Widespread and chronic unemployment force many married women to seek work outside the home. Well over one-third of all wage-earning women in the United States are home-makers as well, thus carrying a double responsibility of contributing to the family fund and doing housework at the same time.

One of the chief expressions of the continued inferior position to which women are subjected in capitalist society is its indifference to the economic burden of motherhood. No social responsibility is taken for motherhood. It is left as the individual concern of the family. There are no federal laws in the United States to protect the jobs of mothers, there are no maternity benefits.

Karl Marx realized the importance of the factor of motherhood in women's struggle for economic independence. In 1866 he proposed at the Congress of the First International that state protection for mother and child be established in all countries. Since then protection of mother and child has been a plank in the platform of every Communist Party.

Socialism Guarantees Equal Rights

Under the personal guidance of Lenin, this program of protection of mother and child has been put into practice in the Soviet Union as a state and trade union responsibility, and has played a decisive part in wiping out the inequality of women in that country.

Petty, nerve-racking housework, Lenin pointed out, keeps women from taking their place in life on an equal plane with men. "The real emancipation of women," Lenin declared in a speech in June, 1919, "real communism, will begin only when a mass struggle (led by the proletariat which is in power) is started against this petty domestic economy, or rather when it is *transformed on a mass scale* into large-scale socialist economy." He stressed the need for public dining-rooms, day nurseries, and kindergartens. He emphasized "the simple everyday means, which assume nothing pompous, grandiloquent or solemn, but which can *in fact emancipate women*, which can in fact lessen and

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

abolish their inferiority to men in regard to their role in social production and in social life." "These means," he pointed out, "are not new; they (like all the material prerequisites for socialism) were created by large-scale capitalism, but under capitalism they remained, first, a rarity, and, second, and what is particularly important, either profit-making enterprises, with all the worst features of speculation, profiteering, cheating and fraud, or the 'acrobatics of bourgeois philanthropy,' which the best workers quite rightly hated and despised."

Many of these measures, the need of which Lenin indicated in 1919, have now been realized in the Soviet Union, following the successful realization of the Stalinist Five-Year Plans, which industrialized the country and collectivized the land. Women in the Soviet Union, including housewives who do not work outside the home, now have the opportunity to match their skill and abilities in every field with all others. No other country has such large numbers of women scientists, aviators, parachutists, engineers, and other distinguished women personalities in labor, educational, social and other fields where they give the greatest service to the people of their country.

Today forty million homes in the Soviet Union have become places of happy communion between members of the family, bound together by the knowledge of their individual contributions to the building of the new happy life of security under socialism. In this, the women, including the wife and mother, participate on an equal plane with all the others. Family life in the Soviet Union is more stable than it ever was when the country was under the capitalist yoke. Only socialism guarantees this freedom and happy family life for the masses of women.

Under capitalism, millions of housewives in the United States are unable to use the modern equipment that would greatly reduce household work and its drudgery, because of the high costs imposed by the monopolies. The beautiful apartment hotels with their up-to-the-minute modern facilities, free from stultifying petty housework, are available only to the women of the rich.

The Bourgeois Shibboleth of "Equal Rights"

In the present crisis, when finance capital and its agents resort to every demagogic trick in the drive to force the American people into the imperialist war, it is not surprising that the two major parties of capitalism find it necessary to make a special effort to enlist the support of the women.

The Republican Party convention endorsed the "Equal Rights" Amendment to the United States Constitution. This resolution is only a trap to catch the votes of women. It is typical of the empty formal equality offered women by bourgeois democracy. This Amendment, if adopted, would not give women equal pay for equal work with men. The Amendment, in practice, would endanger the efforts of women to get state protection of their jobs. If adopted, it would endanger existing

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

laws that have helped women improve their economic conditions, such as state laws providing minimum wages for women. Such laws as protect the health of women, as for instance those in the states of California, Washington, Massachusetts, Ohio, Pennsylvania and Utah, prohibiting the employment of women in tasks which require the carrying of heavy loads, would be declared unconstitutional. Protective legislation for women gained as a result of a century of agitation and struggle would be wiped out. The Republican sponsorship of the "Equal Rights" Amendment is thus thoroughly consistent with its support for the M-Day Plan which would suspend protective legislation for women and children during an "emergency" such as war. The Republican Party seeks the emasculation, if not revocation, of the Federal Fair Labor Standards Act, which prohibits wage differentials on the basis of sex, and of the Wagner Act, and is generally opposed to social and labor legislation. It tries to cloak its reactionary policy with an ineffectual formal "equality" for women. It is essentially a demagogic attempt to win the support of the women in its bid for power to carry out Wall Street's imperialist war policy.

The Democratic Party convention also made a bid for the women's votes with a gesture of formal recognition of women's equality. The convention decided to place an equal number of women and men on its committees. A handful of women, professional stooges of the state or city bosses of the Democratic Party machines, will be appointed to these committees and will work to sell the war measures of the Roosevelt Administration to women voters. To the masses of women, this 50-50 policy gives nothing. The policy of capitalist parties makes political training inaccessible to the masses of women. The Democratic Party gesture will contribute nothing for betterment of the economic and social position of masses of women. Tons of paper have been wasted by sincere workers in various departments of the Roosevelt Administration which investigated the conditions under which women live, and in some instances recommended plans for improvement. Women had hoped and expected that the Administration would carry out some of these proposals. But, instead of life and bread, the women and their families are given prospects of bullets and death. Great amounts of money are spent for imperialist war purposes, but the Administration pleads lack of funds to provide for those things that women and their families need most, such as better housing, improved public health services, assistance to the youth and the unemployed. The whole present policy of the Roosevelt Administration is a flagrant exposure of the Democratic Party's convention demagogy.

This sudden concern of the two parties is also due to the enhanced role that women would play "behind the front," should finance capital succeed in its imperialist war conspiracy.

The M-Day plan together with the Democrat-Republican sponsored

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

conscription bill, would destroy the existing standard of living and regiment the entire family. In the M-Day plan there is a provision for a Women's and Minors' Bureau which would force women and children into employment as deemed necessary by the military brass hats. Wages for women will be fixed and strictly controlled. And it is under these conditions that plans are made to bring masses of women into the war industries. Is this the reason why the two ruling parties now talk so much about "equality" for women?

In a bulletin recently published by the U. S. Labor Department's Women's Bureau, entitled *Effective Industrial Use of Women in the Defense Program,* it is pointed out that women will be subjected to conditions that will cause heavy strain upon their health. The bulletin proposes safeguards around machinery, goggles to protect eyes, proper distribution of light to avoid accidents, plastic masks, lift trucks, special ventilation and exhaust systems that would eliminate specific substances which have an injurious effect on women, like benzene, which may dispose to hemorrhage; carbon disulphide, which attacks the nervous system, producing a result similar to insanity; proper seating, to avoid harm to pelvic organs. There are a number of other suggestions, including those affecting wages and hours. As suggestions they are good; but who will believe that big industrialists will voluntarily invest capital for such purposes, especially since they will claim that the employment of women in such industries is a temporary measure in the "emergency" situation. Who will believe this in the face of their extortionist profiteering policy in connection with "national defense"? They are demanding tax concessions, removal of the profit ceiling from government armament orders. Will the industrialists be compelled to safeguard the women workers in the war industries when in Washington Democratic and Republican representatives alike support the Roosevelt policy of paring away labor's rights? No, only the greater organization and struggle of women, especially through the trade unions and with the support of all truly progressive forces, will force the realization of these necessary measures for the protection of women.

Yes, the Democratic and Republican parties talk loud now about "equality" of women. They expect thus to veil from women the plans of monopoly capital to drag our country into the imperialist war. But women are increasingly awakening to the real meaning of these plans.

The Women's Movement for Peace

A veritable peace crusade of women is rising from organizations in the neighborhoods, from trade union groups, women's trade union auxiliaries, mothers' clubs and church groups—fresh springs which swell the mighty growing people's movement to stop conscription and to keep our country out of this bloody massacre. In 1914-18, the women's peace movement in the United States had no roots among the women masses. It collapsed like the walls of Jericho when the

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

United States entered the war. Its bourgeois leaders became organizers of women in support of the war. The flowering of today's women's peace movement comes from conscious organization of the masses of women who refuse to follow the handful of bourgeois and petty-bourgeois top leaders of national women's organizations, who in the spring of 1938 vowed to fight for peace but who now are on the war wagon of the imperialists, ready to doll up the war drive with glowing promises of "equality." The influence of these bourgeois women misleaders is, however, far from destroyed. The forward movement of the women masses makes necessary the exposure and defeat of these capitalist representatives and agents.

Today, it is the women from among the working people who have the courage to lead the women's movement for peace. When the labor women's peace committee, composed of women from various women's groups in the East, recently went to Washington to oppose the Burke-Wadsworth Conscription Bill, the strength of labor which they represented prevented the shutting of doors in their faces as was the case with Jane Addams in 1917 when she led an anti-war delegation of women to the White House. Today's women came from the shops, from working class families; they demanded that Congressmen and Senators listen to the voice of the people who are against conscription. And now women in many other parts of the country are following their example, organizing women's peace committees to oppose the passage of the conscription bill. In 1917 women had no vote. Today women are voters. Politicians fear that women may follow up their demand with the ballot next November, hence the concern about women's protests against conscription. It devolves upon the labor movement to encourage the more rapid development of this women's peace movement as an aid in defense of labor's rights.

Women are supporting the legislative program of the trade unions, and should insist that a system of state-controlled maternity benefits become part of their legislative program. To organize the women in the trade unions and in the women's trade union auxiliaries for maternity benefits, for defense and extension of special laws to protect women's economic position, including equal pay for equal work, is part of the fight to maintain the Federal Fair Labor Standards Act. As part of this Act, the Federal Public Contracts Act provides that no work shall be done in unsanitary surroundings or under conditions dangerous to health and safety of employees. This particularly applies to the conditions of working women. The maintenance of this Act is a necessary measure to protect labor's standards of living and its rights.

The guarantee for a successful women's movement for peace and equal rights is in leadership by women from the ranks of labor. The working women's movement has for its object the fight for the economic, social, as well as political equality of women. An organic part of this fight is the struggle to put an end to the disfranchisement of the Ne-

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

gro women in the South, through the poll-tax and other measures of discrimination.

The only party that encourages, educates, and helps women to act independently towards this goal is the Communist Party. Thereby it helps to open up a wide field of activity for the masses of women. The Communist Party makes it possible for working women, Negro and white, to come forward as leaders, to train themselves politically, and take their place with men in the vanguard of the working class movement, which from its inception included equality for working women as an integral part of its program.

The Party's election campaign platform has filled our Communist women with enthusiasm, and on the basis of this platform women Party members have taken a leading part in the campaign to place the Party on the ballot. Every Party branch can get women members to carry the Party's platform to the women masses.

Our platform of peace and prosperity is not only a guide towards achieving the most urgent needs of the working people, but it tells the women, it tells the working people how it is possible to achieve the dream of millions—everlasting peace and security of life for all. Those who come to know our platform, and our work, will see through the hoax of "equality" with which the Republican and Democratic parties are trying to delude the women into support of the imperialist plans of monopoly capital.

In the words of Lenin, we say to the masses of women:

"Down with this fraud! Down with the liars who are talking of freedom and equality *for all*, while there is an oppressed sex, while there are oppressor classes, while there is private ownership of capital, of shares, while there are the well-fed with their surplus of bread who keep the hungry in bondage."

By going to the women masses with our platform, we will succeed in exposing these honeyed hypocritical phrases about democracy for all through an imperialist war. We will succeed in gaining the support of many women to defend the Communist Party, to help put it on the ballot, to swell the votes for Earl Browder and James W. Ford, and to win many new women fighters as members of the Communist Party.

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

A New Autobiography!

WE ARE MANY!

BY ELLA REEVE BLOOR

Packed with intimate reminiscences of one of the most beloved militants in the American labor movement, Mother Bloor's long-awaited autobiography will bring to its readers a wealth of stirring human-interest stories of her experiences and struggles over many decades. Tracing her ancestors back to the Revolutionary and Civil Wars, Ella Reeve Bloor goes on to describe her childhood days, including her impressions of a neighbor, Walt Whitman. Among the other personalities she knew well and writes revealingly of are Henry Ward Beecher and Horace Traubel, James Keir Hardie and Tom Mann, Daniel DeLeon, Victor Berger, Eugene Debs, Charles Ruthenberg, Bill Haywood, as well as leaders of the suffrage movement with which she was closely associated.

One of the most striking sections of the book is her account of the important role she played as an investigator in the Chicago stockyards for Upton Sinclair during the period when **The Jungle** appeared.

In her book are many vivid narratives of strike struggles from Pullman to the Ludlow Massacre to Passaic and Gastonia; of participation in political movements from the old Socialist-Labor and Socialist Parties and the I.W.W. to the Communist Party, of barnstorming for Foster and Browder in Presidential campaigns; of untiring work in behalf of political prisoners, especially in the period during and after the World War, when the Palmer raids terrorized the labor movement; of experiences with rank-and-file people in every section of the land and during every crucial phase in the modern history of the American working class.

Ready Late September. Price $2.00

•

Order from

WORKERS LIBRARY PUBLISHERS

P. O. Box 148, Station D, New York, N. Y.

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

In a Popular Abridged Edition!

THE SECOND IMPERIALIST WAR

BY EARL BROWDER

128 Pages. Price 25 cents

●

This new volume constitutes a political handbook on the forces, at home and abroad, which have unleashed the Second Imperialist World War. It reflects the development of the basic policies of the Communist Party in relation to the unfolding of events on the international arena during the last year, events which have made the struggle for peace the central issue in the 1940 elections.

". . . Browder produced this book during the course of hard and tireless work as leader of the Communist Party," wrote Clarence Hathaway, in a recent review. "It came out of the crucible of the Party's vanguard role in the struggle of the people's forces to prevent this war, to stop its spread, to bring it to an early end, to prevent the United States from being drawn into it. It is the work of a Marxist-Leninist political leader who understands well how to make great contributions to the theoretical growth of the working class movement while giving it direct every-day leadership in its struggle for its class aims." (*The Communist*, July, 1940.)

In addition to the most basic articles and speeches of the original edition of *The Second Imperialist War*, published at $2.00, the Popular Abridged Edition contains Earl Browder's speech accepting the Communist Party's nomination as candidate for President of the United States.

●

Order from

WORKERS LIBRARY PUBLISHERS

P. O. Box 148, Station D, New York, N. Y.

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED